

# Rhetorius, Zeno's Astrologer, and a Sixth-Century Astrological Compendium

LEVENTE LÁSZLÓ

Since astrological works composed before the advent of book printing belonged to the realm of *Gebrauchsliteratur*, virtually every astrological handbook written in the Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine era exhibits traces of extensive abbreviations, supplementations, interpolations, and other changes in its extant form.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, these handbooks have mostly survived in various recensions, epitomes, or excerpts, which often do not allow a convincing reconstruction of the “original,” even if there are variants that seem complete. For example, the handbook of the early fifth-century Hephaestio of Thebes—itsself excerpted mainly from the astrological opus of Claudius Ptolemy and the didactic poem of Dorotheus of Sidon—is extant in no fewer than three extensive epitomes and at least two shorter excerpts. Still, we do have a “main” version, however incomplete and faultily transmitted it is.<sup>2</sup>

1 D. Pingree, “Antiochus and Rhetorius,” *CPh* 72 (1977): 203. While Pingree allowed that Ptolemy’s *Ἀποτελεσματικά* ([Astrological] indications) might be an exception, the conclusions of G. Vuillemin-Diem and C. Steel, ed., *Ptolemy’s Tetrabiblos in the Translation of William of Moerbeke* (Leuven, 2015), 93–94, suggest that it is not.

2 S. Heilen, “Problems in Translating Ancient Greek Astrological Texts,” in *Writings of Early Scholars in the Ancient Near East, Egypt, Rome, and Greece*, ed. A. Imhausen and T. Pommerening (Berlin, 2010), 300–303. For a synoptic edition of the chapter discussed here, see idem, *Hadriani genitura: Die astrologischen Fragmente des Antigonos von Nikaia: Edition, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (Berlin, 2015), 130–81; for Heilen’s reconstruction of a section within it, see “Translating Greco-Roman Astrological Texts,” in *Translating*

But some cases are more complicated. In dozens of manuscripts, the remnants of a Byzantine astrological compendium can be discovered in various epitomes, which can be supplemented with a few more related texts. To date, the most thorough examination of these texts has been carried out by David Pingree: he examined several texts attributed or related to Antiochus of Athens and concluded that most of them—Epitomes III–V, which are primary, and Epitomes IIb, IIIa, IIIb, and IIIc, which are secondary—are ultimately based on a lost astrological compendium originally written by Rhetorius of Egypt in the early seventh century.<sup>3</sup> Apart from these epitomes, he identified a few more texts that once belonged to the compendium and investigated its traces in later Byzantine and Arabic literature. He promised to publish the results of his investigations in his edition of Rhetorius—which has not yet been completed, even after thirty years of his efforts and, following his death in 2005, the appointment of a new editor, Stephan Heilen.

*Writings of Early Scholars in the Ancient Near East, Egypt, Greece and Rome: Methodological Aspects with Examples*, ed. A. Imhausen and T. Pommerening (Berlin, 2016), 522–28.

3 Pingree, “Antiochus and Rhetorius,” 203–23, and idem, “From Alexandria to Baghdād to Byzantium,” *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 8.1 (2001): 3–37. These fundamental articles will be extensively used below, and therefore only the most important claims are referenced. For more references, see Heilen, *Hadriani genitura*, 25 n. 100.

Pingree's views about what constituted the original compendium, when the different epitomes were composed, how they are related to each other, and who the author of the original compendium was have remained mostly unchallenged, presumably owing to the extreme complexity of the problems. However, a critical reexamination and reevaluation of the texts and Pingree's conclusions on them reveal that some of his theses must be refined. The present article details the results of such an endeavor.

## The Compendium

### *The Main Epitome*

Of the epitomes attributed to Rhetorius, the most extensive one—Pingree's Epitome III—is book V of Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, grec 2425 (hereafter designated *R*), a manuscript copied in the early fourteenth century. Titled Ἐκ τῶν Ἀντιόχου Θησαυρῶν Ἐπίλυσις καὶ διήγησις πάσης ἀστρονομικῆς τέχνης (Explanation and interpretation of all astrology from Antiochus's *Treasures*), it is a seemingly self-contained genethliological treatise<sup>4</sup> divided into 117 chapters.<sup>5</sup> It begins with a general astrological

introduction, written mainly from a genethliological perspective (unit A: chaps. 1–45),<sup>6</sup> followed by a unit dealing with various general genethliological topics (B: chaps. 46–60; chap. 51 is not specifically genethliological). There follows an incomplete specific genethliological part: the topics of bodily and mental issues (C: chaps. 61–76), the circumstances of death and the issue of flourishing (D: chaps. 77–81; chaps. 79–80 are more general in nature), activities (E: chaps. 82–96), parents (F: chaps. 97–102), and siblings (G: chaps. 103–8) are covered; a number of topics common in astrological handbooks—marriage and children as well as friends and enemies, travel, length of life calculations, and predictive methods—are missing. Somewhat unexpectedly, the next unit is about lunar configurations (H: chaps. 109–12), which would more appropriately be placed in unit A,<sup>7</sup> and the book concludes with an elaborate analysis of the nativity of a grammarian who was born in 440 and executed in 484 (I: chaps. 113–17); he is identified as the poet and philosopher Pamprepus of Panopolis.<sup>8</sup>

Although, as will be surveyed below, there is more evidence beside the incompleteness of the specific genethliological part to prove that the treatise as it is

4 One of the main branches of Hellenistic and Roman astrology, “genethliology” (γενεθλιαλογία) focuses on “nativities” (γενέσεις or γεννήσεις): that is, horoscopes cast for the location and time of the birth of a person, and other horoscopes closely related to nativities; see D. Pingree, “Astrology,” in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas*, ed. P. P. Wiener, 5 vols. (New York, 1973–74), 1:119–23. Another main branch aims at interpreting “inceptions” (καταρχαί), which are horoscopes cast for the known or planned beginning of an event or action (e.g., the discovery of the theft or the foundation of a city), in order to find out more about an event that already occurred or to ensure the wished outcome of a planned action.

5 The entire text is due to be published, after the late David Pingree, by Stephan Heilen. The previous editions are partial and mostly conflated: F. Boll in *CCAG* 1:140–64 (chaps. 1–53 from the manuscripts of Epitomes II, IIb and IIIb, omitting the chapters included in Ps.-Porph. *In Ptol.*); F. Cumont in *CCAG* 8.4:115–253 (chaps. 54–98, 104, and 113–17 from *R* and the manuscripts of Epitomes IIIb and IV; chaps. 113–17 were reedited in D. Pingree, “Political Horoscopes from the Reign of Zeno,” *DOP* 30 [1976]: 144–46); E. Boer and S. Weinstock in *CCAG* 5.4:220–26 (the chapters in Ps.-Porph. *In Ptol.*, for which see n. 6 below, from the manuscript of Epitome II and three manuscripts of [Pseudo-]Porphyry); and D. Pingree, ed., *Dorothei Sidonii carmen astrologicum* (Leipzig, 1976), 333–34 (chap. 103 from *R*), 335–37 (chaps. 105–8 from *R*). *Dorothei Sidonii carmen* additionally contains a full or partial reedition of chaps. 3,

19, 48, 55, 57, 61, 66, 97–98, and 115, where the previously neglected readings of *R* are also considered. Extracts from chaps. 101–2 from *R* are edited in the apparatus in S. Feraboli, ed., *Hermetis Trismegisti de triginta sex decanis* (Turnhout, 1994), 72, 75, 188, 191, 199, 203, but otherwise chaps. 99–102 and 109–11 are still unedited. Also note that until chap. 36a, the chapter numbering of *R* and the chapter numbering of the manuscript of Epitome II, which was used in Boll's edition, differ: the unnumbered preface and chap. 1 in Boll's and Pingree's editions correspond to chaps. 1 and 2 in *R*, respectively, and so forth. In this article, the numbering of *R* is followed, and the references to these and other editions in *CCAG* and elsewhere are identified by the editor: Bo for Boll, BW for Boer and Weinstock, Cu for Cumont, CK for Cumont and Kroll, He for Heeg, K for Kroll, O for Olivieri, P for Pingree, and Zu for Zuretti. A full list of abbreviations for the editors and texts under discussion has been placed in an appendix at the end of this article.

6 Chaps. 11–13, 15–16, and 46 were copied into some manuscripts of Ps.-Porph. *In Ptol.* as chaps. 47–52.

7 Chap. 109 revisits the conditions already introduced in chaps. 36 and 37, for which chap. 110 serves as an illustration; chaps. 111 and 112 similarly revisit the conditions discussed in chaps. 38 and 39, respectively.

8 The nativity is Hor. gr. 440.IX.29 in the most recent comprehensive catalogue of horoscopes, Heilen, *Hadriani genitura*, 204–333; for the horoscope and Pamprepus, see the literature in *ibid.*, 301–2. I henceforth will use Heilen's reference system for the horoscopes.

Table 1. Internal Cross-References within Units

Unit	Chapter	Chapter Referenced
A	13, p. 222.5–6 BW	11
	15, p. 223.7–9 BW	16
	16, p. 223.17 BW	14
	16, p. 224.5–7 BW	14 or 16
	22, p. 155.23 Bo	21?
D	81, p. 207.10–12 Cu	78
	81, p. 207.18–19 Cu	77
E	83, p. 210.21–22 Cu	82
	84, p. 214.1–3 Cu	83
F	101, fol. 134v <i>R</i>	97?
I	117, p. 224.2 Cu	113

Table 2. Cross-References Connecting Different Units

Units	Chapter	Chapter Referenced
A and B	10, p. 149.24 Bo	54
	12, p. 221 app. crit. ad 24 BW	58
	13, p. 222.7–8 BW	49–51
	19, p. 155.5–6 Bo	60
A and C	6, p. 147.13 Bo	66–76
	7, p. 147.20 Bo	61–62
	61, p. 187.6–10 Cu	7

found in *R* is not complete, numerous intra-unit and inter-unit cross-references demonstrate that the text is a consciously edited treatise and not a mere compilation of chapters copied somewhat randomly from various sources. Several such cross-references prove that at least units A B C (chaps. 1–76)—the divisions between which are also somewhat arbitrary—belong together (see tables 1–2), and the direct and indirect cross-references in unit I attach it to units A B C D E.<sup>9</sup>

9 Chap. 113 refers to the calculation of the topical places (τόποι) according to the degree (pp. 221.13–222.2 Cu), which is expounded in chap. 46 (unit B); to the rising times (p. 221.16 Cu), which are discussed in chaps. 14 and 50 (units A and B); and to the planetary periods (p. 221.16–19 Cu), which are described in chap. 49 (unit B). In chap. 114, Pamprepus's profession is explained astrologically, and the factors considered are given in chaps. 82–83 and 85 (unit E). In chap. 116, the native's lustfulness is ascertained on the grounds of the indications listed in chaps. 6, 66, and 76 (units A and C). Finally, in

However, as Pingree already pointed out, neither the entire treatise nor units A B C D E I—or merely units A B C—can constitute a direct epitome from Antiochus of Athens, which is what the title suggests. In chapter 19, Paulus of Alexandria's computation method for the “twelfth-parts” (δωδεκατημόρια), introduced in Paul. Al. 22, is referred to; but Paulus wrote his introductory work in 378, whereas Antiochus, who is cited by the early fourth-century Firmicus Maternus, must have lived much earlier.<sup>10</sup> Also, in chapter 58 the longitudes of the eminent fixed stars are calculated for 504, which is the terminus post quem for at least

chap. 117, the seventh day of the moon is mentioned in connection with its rising fortune, a factor described in chap. 81 (unit D).

10 Firm. *Math.* 2.29.2. For Paulus, see D. Pingree, “Paul of Alexandria,” in *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, ed. C. G. Gillispie, 16 vols. (New York, 1970–80), 10:419; for Antiochus, see idem, “Antiochus and Rhetorius,” 204, 207, and “From Alexandria to Baghdad,” 9.

units A B C.<sup>11</sup> On the contrary, Pingree assumed that the example horoscope found in chapter 110, which he dated as for 601, marks the terminus post quem for the entire treatise and thus concluded that its final redaction took place in the early sixth century.<sup>12</sup> There are, however, quite a few counterarguments that make Pingree's hypothesis implausible:

- Although the positions of each planet are given, the ascendant is missing, which makes it doubtful that a genuine horoscope is being discussed.<sup>13</sup>
- The stellar positions in chapter 58 are calculated using Ptolemaic parameters,<sup>14</sup> and Ptolemy's data are used to calculate Pamprepus's horoscope.<sup>15</sup> But the positions in chapter 110 do not match with any planetary alignment calculated by Ptolemaic or modern methods between the first and thirteenth centuries.
- Except for the sun's degree and Venus's zodiacal sign and degree, each planetary position is extensively used in the description, and therefore the emendation of the numbers is mostly not possible.<sup>16</sup> (Venus's position relative to the sun is also astronomically impossible, but this fault is corrected by Pingree's sound emendation.)

11 Pingree, "Antiochus and Rhetorius," 211, and "From Alexandria to Baghdād," 7; see also below, n. 14.

12 See Pingree, *Dorothei Sidonii carmen*, xii–xiii, for the dating and the positions given in the text and according to Pingree's computations; see also idem, "Antiochus and Rhetorius," 221, and "From Alexandria to Baghdād," 10. It is Heilen's Hor. gr. 601.II.24?

13 This is the opinion of J. H. Holden, ed. and trans., *Porphyry the Philosopher: Introduction to the Tetrabiblos and Serapio of Alexandria, Astrological Definitions* (Tempe, AZ, 2009), ix–x, 158. However, the version of *Liber Aristotilis* 2.16.3–13 (*The Liber Aristotilis of Hugo of Santalla*, ed. C. Burnett and D. Pingree [London, 1997], 27, 134–35) does seem to refer to the sun's position being in the ascendant, but that may be due to an error occurring in the long chain of transmission or copying. Regardless, the ascendant is never referred to in the description.

14 To the longitudes included in Ptolemy's star catalogue (Ptol. *Alm.* 7.4) for the epoch 20 July 137 are added 3° 40', corresponding to 366½ years if one takes Ptolemy's erroneous precession constant of 1°/100 years.

15 A. Jones, "Ancient Rejection and Adoption of Ptolemy's Frame of Reference for Longitudes," in *Ptolemy in Perspective: Use and Criticism of His Work from Antiquity to the Nineteenth Century*, ed. A. Jones (New York, 2010), 34; Pamprepus's horoscope is L440.

16 Ibid., 44 n. 63.

In conclusion, the horoscope in chapter 110 is very probably a fictitious example devised for illustrative purposes. Therefore, it is still possible that the treatise was completed in the sixth century.

Nonetheless, *R* is not alone in containing the treatise: a text comprising chapters 1–53 and an additional chapter, 36a, under the same title as in *R* is found in another manuscript, Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Pluteus 28.34 (hereafter *L*), which was copied around the 1060s. Pingree assumed that the text in *L* had in fact been epitomized from Antiochus's *Θησαυροί*, and hence designated it as Epitome II, while he assumed that the longer treatise found in *R*, Epitome III, was a supplemented variant.<sup>17</sup> Still, the fundamental unity of units A B C, as well as possibly D E and I, suggests that Epitome II in *L* is only an incomplete text;<sup>18</sup> and there is no need to isolate chapters 1–53 as the only ones related to Antiochus. In fact, after comparing the treatise with the extant summary of Antiochus's *Εἰσαγωγικά* (Introductory matters; Pingree's Epitome I, which is chapter A<62> in book VI of *R*),<sup>19</sup> we can conclude that what appears to be an epitome of *Θησαυροί* in the treatise is a heavily reworked and supplemented version of the *Εἰσαγωγικά*;<sup>20</sup> in other words, *Θησαυροί* may be merely the alternative title of *Εἰσαγωγικά*. Still, it is difficult to ascertain exactly what material derives from Antiochus, since the Egyptians, Phnaëc, Teucer of

17 Pingree, "Antiochus and Rhetorius," 222. The text in *L* was thoroughly revised by Isaac Argyrus between 1372 and 1382 when he composed his version, which is Epitome IIa; see R. Caballero Sánchez, "Historia del texto del Comentario anónimo al Tetrabiblos de Tolomeo," *MHNH* 13 (2013): 97, superseding Pingree's claim that the redactor was John Abramius.

18 In fact, *L* is an anthology that includes many excerpts, epitomes, and incomplete texts. It appears to contain only the following complete works: the *Iatromathematica* attributed to Hermes Trismegistus (fols. 1–6), a version of the pseudo-Galenic *De decubitu* (fols. 6–17), and Paraphrase I of Maximus's *Περὶ καταρχῶν* (On inceptions, fols. 165–168).

19 This epitome was edited by Cumont in *CCAG* 8.3:111–18.

20 R. Schmidt, trans., *Definitions and Foundations* (Cumberland, MD, 2009), 21, and L. László, "Revisiting the Authenticity of Porphyry's Introduction to Ptolemy's Apotelesmatics," *CPh* (forthcoming). Chaps. 2, 3, 17, 20–29, 31–33, 35–37, 39–41, and 43 of the treatise seem to be revisions of book I of the *Εἰσαγωγικά*, while the second section of book II may be a source for chaps. 52–54 (on the lights) and units C D E, or possibly even more. Also note that of the related texts discussed below, *SE* 24, *Signs, Plan.*, and *Mixt.* are perhaps also partly based on the two books of the *Εἰσαγωγικά*.



Babylon, Dorotheus of Sidon, Ptolemy, Vettius Valens, Antigonos of Nicaea, and Paulus of Alexandria are also referred to or even cited, and a few of them may post-date Antiochus; Paulus is certainly later.

The treatise was translated to Middle Persian in the sixth or seventh century, for the Persian al-Andarzaghār (presumably seventh century)<sup>21</sup> must have relied on it, and from his lost version—which, following Pingree, could be dubbed “Epitome VI”—are derived *Liber Aristotilis*, Hugo of Santalla's twelfth-century Latin translation of an Arabic text (most likely a direct translation from al-Andarzaghār's Persian), and Sahl ibn Bishr's *Kitāb al-mawālīd* (Book of nativities).<sup>22</sup> In these late sources, one can discover every unit of the treatise except I, Pampreprius's nativity, but neither of these works contains casebook nativities.<sup>23</sup> Also, the star catalogue of chapter 58, without any attempts to update it, was translated to Middle Persian and then to Arabic; the incomplete Arabic version and its complete Latin translation made by Salio of Padua in the twelfth century are extant, and he attributes the authorship to “Hermes.”<sup>24</sup>

Still, a handful of cross-references to passages not found in the treatise and the testimonies of a few parallel texts imply that the treatise as it stands in *R* is incomplete. In the upcoming sections, I will attempt to collect the texts that, together with this main epitome (hereafter *ME*), constituted the astrological compendium.

### *A Second Book of the Main Epitome?*

In his articles, Pingree conjectured that at least a part of the untitled book VI of *R* originally also belonged to

the compendium.<sup>25</sup> (I will hereafter refer to this book as *App.*) In fact, there is only one cross-reference that substantiates such a claim: *ME* 13 refers to a table of the bright and dark degrees, which is found as *App.* A17; this will be examined below. Otherwise, unlike *ME*, *App.* is a disorderly collection of astronomical and astrological matters. Its chapters are numbered haphazardly: first from 1 to 61; then an unnumbered chapter, <62>, which belongs to the previous section; and finally the numbering restarts from 4 to 86. There are also many unnumbered chapters inserted between numbered ones.<sup>26</sup>

To give a few glimpses of the content: we find an abbreviated and rewritten version of Paulus of Alexandria's introductory work (*App.* A24–<40>), an epitome from Julianus of Laodicea's Περὶ καταρχῶν (On inceptions; *App.* A42–51), summaries of mostly lost astrological works (*App.* A<53>–<62>), and an eleventh-century Arabo-Byzantine astronomical manual titled Μέθοδοι ψηφοφορίας διαφόρων ὑποθέσεων ἀστρονομικῶν (Methods of computing various astronomical hypotheses; *App.* B28–69).<sup>27</sup> Pingree supposed that the section belonging to *ME* ended with *App.* A52, a casebook nativity dated to 497 and excerpted from a work by Eutocius of Ascalon, for two reasons: first, the section's structure would then mirror that of *ME*, which also concludes with a nativity, and second, the following chapter, *App.* A52a, is an ephemeris calculated for 796, certainly much later than his proposed dating for *ME*.<sup>28</sup> However, the stark contrast between the orderly structure of *ME* and the heterogeneity of *App.* A1–52 makes Pingree's hypothesis quite implausible. While some chapters outside of *App.* A17 may have belonged to the original compendium, whose most substantial part is *ME*, this contrast and other arguments discussed below mostly exclude the possibility that *App.* A1–52 as a whole constituted a “second book” of the compendium.

21 C. Burnett and A. al-Hamdi, “Zādānfarrūkh al-Andarzaghār on Anniversary Horoscopes,” *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der arabisch-islamischen Wissenschaften* 1 (1991–92): 295.

22 B. N. Dykes, trans., *The Astrology of Sahl b. Bishr*, vol. 1, *Principles, Elections, Questions, Nativities* (Minneapolis 2008), 27–32.

23 As it has been pointed out, *Liber Aristotilis* does contain a version of the fictitious example (Hor. gr. 601.II.24?; see n. 13), and it also has Dorotheus's Hor. gr. 44.X.2 (3.1.10.25–51; Burnett and Pingree, *The Liber Aristotilis*, 44–46, 144, cf. Heilen, *Hadriani genitura* [n. 2 above], 221–23), which is extant in Dorotheus. 3.2.19–44, but this latter is an example of continuous horoscopy. Otherwise, present in these works in some form are chaps. 2–3, 18–19, 24–25, 27, 31, 36, 41, 44, 55, 58, 61–62, 64–66, 77, 82–96, 99–103, 105–8, and 110 of the treatise.

24 P. Kunitzsch, “Liber de stellis beibenii,” in *Hermetis Trismegisti astrologica et divinatoria*, ed. G. Bos et al. (Turnhout, 2001), 15–21 (introduction), 56–81 (Arabic and Latin text).

25 Pingree, “Antiochus and Rhetorius,” 221, and “From Alexandria to Baghdād,” 12.

26 I refer to these two sections using A and B before the chapter number, respectively, and use “a” for unnumbered insertions.

27 This manual was edited in A. Jones, ed., *An Eleventh-Century Manual of Arabo-Byzantine Astronomy* (Amsterdam, 1987).

28 Pingree, “From Alexandria to Baghdād,” 12; the ephemeris was edited in idem, “A Greek Ephemeris for 796,” *Centaurus* 45 (2003): 79–82. Eutocius's horoscope is Hor. gr. 497.X.28.

### *The Immediate Cognates of Manuscript R*

Pingree discovered two groups of manuscripts that are closely related to *R*; he labeled the variants cognate to books V and VI of *R* Epitomes IIIb and IIIc.<sup>29</sup> A comparison of these texts suggests that *R* and the manuscripts of these epitomes had a common ancestor.<sup>30</sup> This conjecture is further confirmed by the title of a section in the manuscripts of Epitome IIIb, which is the same as that of *ME*.

The texts in these epitomes exhibit the traces of substantial reworking, and there is some evidence that the version in *R* is the most reliable: the chapters related to *R* are often found in sections other than the one bearing the shared title, and the authorship attributions are also often erroneous. Consequently, the attributions of some additional chapters to Antiochus in these epitomes have no value whatsoever,<sup>31</sup> and the manuscripts reveal no more about the relationship of *ME* and *App.* than *R* itself does.

There are three more collections that contain some chapters also found in *R*. As mentioned above, one of them, *L*, has unit A and about the half of unit B of *ME*; it also copies four chapters from *App.*, including two chapters from the revision of Paulus of Alexandria (*App.* A25 and A27a, corresponding to Paul. Al. 16 and 21, respectively). However, it also contains some chapters from a nonrevised variant text.<sup>32</sup> But the remaining two compendia, the thirteenth-century Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vaticanus graecus 1056 (hereafter *V*) and the Ἀποτελεσματικὴ βιβλος (Book of astrology) attributed

Table 3.  
Correspondences between *App.* and *V*

<i>App.</i>	<i>V</i>
A7	1.3–4 [book I, chaps. 3–4] on fols. 28v–30v
A22–23	fol. 163–163v
A46–48	2.29–31, fols. 87v–89v
A49–50	3.30–31 on fols. 182–183

Table 4.  
Correspondences in Chapters between *App.* and “Balchus”

<i>App.</i>	“Balchus”
A5	83 (only a title)
A<6>	82
A8	81 (only a title)
A14–16	84–86
A23	6
A42–45	75–78
A46–48	61–63
A50	79

to “Balchus,”<sup>33</sup> contain chapters in common only with *App.* (tables 3–4).<sup>34</sup>

Consequently, even if a handful of chapters exist that are shared by *L* *V* or “Balchus,” on the one hand, and *App.* or Epitomes IIIb or IIIc, on the other,<sup>35</sup> there

29 Pingree, “Antiochus and Rhetorius,” 213–16. As a matter of fact, Oxford, Bodleian, Holkham gr. 110 (olim 292) of Epitome IIIb is not an apograph but a twin of Munich, BSB, Cod. graec. 287; and Vienna, ÖNB, phil. gr. 179 is not a manuscript of Epitome IIIb proper, since it contains more chapters than the rest of the manuscripts—for these, see Jones, *Manual*, 21–22. I will nevertheless continue referring to the texts of all these manuscripts under the umbrella term “Epitome IIIb.”

30 See the comparison and stemma in Jones, *Manual*, 23–25.

31 Pingree, “Antiochus and Rhetorius,” 214, reaches the same conclusion.

32 The chapters corresponding to A27a (the revision of Paul. Al. 21), A25 (the revision of Paul. Al. 16), and A52 (an excerpt from Eutocius) are found on fols. 138v–144; the chapter corresponding to A20 is on fols. 154v–156; and the unrevised Paul. Al. 2, 14, and 4 are on fols. 168–170.

33 For “Balchus,” see below, n. 78.

34 The chapters common to *V* and “Balchus” are, therefore, *App.* A23 (general instructions on inceptions) and *App.* A46–48 and A50 (catarchic excerpts from Julianus). There are, nonetheless, a few chapters related to *ME*: in *V* (2.<13> [book II, chap. <13>], fol. 71v), a prose paraphrase of a chapter from Dorotheus is discovered (cf. Doroth. 1.3.1–7), which is also the source of *ME* 55; and “Balchus” 135–37 preserves three chapters of the anonymous astrologer of 379, which are rewritten, rearranged, and updated in *ME* as chaps. 58, 67, and 62. But apparently it is *ME* that derives from these chapters, not vice versa.

35 The common chapters that do not involve *App.* (excluding chapters of apparent Arabic origin) are Epitome IIIb xiv = IIIc ix, also in *L* (fol. 124); “Balchus” 4, also in *V* (1.26, fol. 51–51v) and Epitome IIIc (Oxford, Bodleian, Selden Supra 17 [designated *T*], fol. 116); “Balchus” 50, also in *V* (2.32, fol. 93) and Epitome IIIc (*T*, fol. 120v, and Naples, BN, II C 33 [designated *S*], fol. 410v); “Balchus” 67, also

is not enough evidence to postulate a strong relationship between books V and VI of *R*.

*A Summary of the Main Epitome  
and a Secondary Epitome*

*App.* A61, titled Συγκεφαλαιώσεις τῶν Ἀντιόχου Θησαυρῶν οἵτινες ἐπιλύσεις καὶ διηγήσεις τῆς ἀστρονομικῆς ἐπαγγέλλονται τέχνης (Summary of Antiochus's *Treasures*, which provides explanations and interpretations of astrology; Pingree's Epitome IIIa), is evidently a summary of *ME*.<sup>36</sup> Its chapter numbering differs from that of the treatise, but its chapters 1–89 cover the entire *ME*. However, chapter 90 lacks a parallel in *ME*: the summary says that the author—whom the summarizer assumes to be Antiochus—discussed royal nativities in the same manner as Pamprepus's nativity.

Such royal nativities are found nowhere in *R* but appear in Paris, BNF, gr. 2506 (hereafter *B*), a manuscript copied in the early fourteenth century, as chapter 28a (fol. 25), as already discovered by Franz Cumont.<sup>37</sup> It is the nativity of the emperor Leo I's unnamed son, almost entirely ignored by the chronicles, who was born on 25 April 463 and died around 30 September of the same year. The connection is confirmed by the fact that before this chapter, on fols. 1–24v of *B*, is an epitome corresponding to many chapters of *ME*. This epitome, running from chapters 1 to 28 in *B*—which are also found in Paris, BNF, gr. 2424 (hereafter *Z*), a manuscript copied in the late fourteenth century, and the fifteenth-century Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, graecus Z. 335 (coll. 645; hereafter *H*)—constitutes Pingree's Epitome IV.<sup>38</sup> It has also been demonstrated that this

secondary epitome (hereafter *SE*), revising the entirety or parts of units B C D E F G of *ME*, was written in Constantinople in 884 or 887.<sup>39</sup>

The differences between *SE* and *ME* fall into four types:

- Replacements of the noncommittal source identifications of *R* with the authors' names: e.g., τις τῶν σοφῶν (*ME* 81, p. 207, app. crit. ad 20 Cu) is replaced with Οὐάλης ἐν τῷ θ' βιβλίῳ (the corresponding *SE* 11, p. 207.20 Cu).
- Occasional supplementations of the sources missing in *R*: e.g., the addition of καθὼς ὁ Πτολεμαῖος διδάσκει in *SE* 12, p. 209.19–20 Cu, which corresponds to *ME* 82.
- Additions from Valens (*SE* 24, p. 187.12–15 O, corresponding to *ME* 97; cf. Vett. Val. 4.17–25) and Dorotheus (*SE* 28, p. 192.21–25 O, corresponding to *ME* 53; cf. Dorotheus 1.27.43).
- Thorough revisions: e.g., *SE* 26, which is a heavily revised version of *ME* 104–5.

It is quite possible that at least some of the replacements and supplementations were already present in the common archetype, rather than being introduced by the ninth-century Byzantine editor;<sup>40</sup> nevertheless, neither *Liber Aristotilis* nor Sahl refers to their sources, and the relevant passages were not epitomized in Epitome IIIb or IIIc, which could provide passages for comparison. But whatever insertions should be attributed to the ninth-century redactor, there is only one author added in *SE* who postdates Paulus of Alexandria: Julianus of Laodicea, who was active in the late fifth century, in *SE* 2 (which corresponds to *ME* 58).

*SE* 12–23 constitute a section without any equivalent in *ME*. It deals with various astrological

in Epitome IIIc (*T*, fol. 120v, and *S*, fol. 411); and *V*, 2.19 (fol. 75–75v), also in Epitome IIIc (*T*, fol. 118, and *S*, fol. 407).

36 It was edited by Cumont in *CCAG* 8.3:104–10.

37 Hor. gr. 463.IV.25; it was edited by Cumont in *CCAG* 8.4:224–25 and by Pingree, "Political Horoscopes" (n. 5 above), 147–48.

38 *Z*, 1.100–28 (fols. 5v–33v), and *H*, chaps. A95–119 (fols. 100–115). (*H* contains two anthologies of numbered chapters, for which I will use A and B, respectively.) Chap. 12 is missing from *H*, and chap. 1 is ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus in chap. A13 on fols. 28–40. The epitome has not been edited as a whole, but chap. 2 was edited by Cumont in *CCAG* 5.1:219–26; chaps. 12–22 by Cumont in *CCAG* 8.1:220–48; chaps. 23–28 by A. Olivieri in *CCAG* 2:186–92 (the beginning of chap. 26 reedited by Cumont in *CCAG* 8.4:220–21); and the texts of the rest of the chapters can be retrieved from the apparatus of Cumont's edition of *ME* 57–105 (see n. 5). In these editions, *B* and *H* were used.

39 In *SE* 2, year 600 Diocletian—that is, 884—is given as the epoch for the longitudes of the eminent fixed stars (p. 219.6 Cu), and the constant 7° 30' is added to Ptolemy's longitudes in *B Z*, which would correspond to 887; either the year or the constant was rounded. (The scribe of *H* apparently updated the longitudes for his own era.) In *SE* 26, p. 189.29–30 O = 220.11–12 Cu, the author reveals that he is from Byzantium.

40 It has been noted that for unknown reasons, the authors' names seem to be occasionally suppressed in *R*: e.g., where *SE* 27, p. 208.3 Cu, reads τὸν Ἀνουβίωνα, the corresponding *ME* 82 writes the meaningless τὸ σάρει, for which perhaps τὸν σοφὸν should be read; the other idle references to unidentified "wise men" are also suspicious.

calculations, genethliological predictive methods, an elaborated method for analyzing nativities, and the issue of conception. These topics are missing from *ME*, and it is tempting to assume that this insertion had been a part of the original compendium, not preserved in *ME*.<sup>41</sup> Five arguments support this assumption:

- In the same fashion as in *ME*, several internal cross-references to *SE* 1 and 4 are found, including ones outside the insertion.<sup>42</sup>
- The authors referred to in the insertion—the Egyptians, Phnaës, Teucer, Dorotheus, Ptolemy, Valens, and Antigonius—are also mentioned in *ME*.
- As in *ME* 110, in *SE* 14–15 three fictitious example horoscopes are included to illustrate calculations.<sup>43</sup>
- There are two datable casebook nativities in *SE* 12 and 19, computed to 428 and 482, respectively,<sup>44</sup> which exhibit the same features as the two nativities discussed above, including the same era.
- A version of *SE* 23 appears as chapter 1.8 in Sahl's *Kitāb al-mawālīd*.<sup>45</sup>

The first of the datable nativities appears in the genethliological handbooks of the late eighth-century Māshā'allāh and his disciple Abū 'Alī al-Khayyāt, in a different context—a small collection of Dorotheus's and other fifth-century nativities; the latter may well

have been borrowed from the part of the compendium now lost, and with an interpretation not found in *SE*.<sup>46</sup> The Arabic astrologers must have received this collection via a Middle Persian intermediary, much as happened to *ME*.

Finally, some peculiarities of *SE* and its manuscripts must be mentioned. The differences between the numbering of the chapters as they are referred to and as they are actually found in *BZH* suggest that *SE* had further chapters, now lost. Thus, there are three cross-references to chapters not extant in either *SE* or *ME*: “chapter 28,” dealing with the periods of life and premature death, in *SE* 16, p. 239.3–4 Cu; “chapter 4,” discussing nonviable nativities, in *SE* 19, p. 240.27–28 Cu; and an upcoming chapter describing the indications of the contacts (συναφαί) and defluxions (ἀπόρροιαι) in *SE* 22, p. 246.25–26 Cu. Also, *BZ*—and occasionally *H* too—contain some chapters from *App.*, mostly scattered but in one block for *App.* A<6>, A15, and A13.<sup>47</sup> This latter

46 Māshā'allāh's *Kitāb al-mawālīd* (Book of nativities) is extant only in Latin translation, which was edited from an incomplete manuscript in E. S. Kennedy and D. Pingree, *The Astrological History of Māshā'allāh* (Cambridge, MA, 1971), 145–65. But al-Khayyāt's *Kitāb al-mawālīd* is available both in the original Arabic and in two Latin translations (none edited except for a humanist edition of John of Seville's Latin version, first printed in 1546 by Joachim Heller). In *Astrological History*, 166–74, Kennedy and Pingree compare Māshā'allāh's and al-Khayyāt's versions, but Pingree failed to recognize that each of the first seven nativities is copied in a corrupted form from Dorotheus (cf. Dorotheus. 1.24.2–19). (Their Dorothean origin was first acknowledged in B. N. Dykes, *Works of Sahl & Māshā'allāh* [Minneapolis, 2008], 404–10.) The next four nativities are dated to 439, 464, 428, and 442, and the third is our Hor. gr. 428.IX.8. Unfortunately, there is no positive evidence to link the other three fifth-century nativities to Hor. gr. 428.IX.8 beyond the century, the usage of Ptolemaic parameters, and the similar interpretive patterns.

47 These are in *B*, chaps. 162–64 (fols. 58v–59), and *Z*, 2.97–99 (fols. 66–67). In *H*, the chapters corresponding to *App.* A<6>\* and A15\* are A319–20 (fols. 196v–197), while the chapter corresponding to *App.* A13 is A223 (fol. 169). Further chapters common to the manuscripts of *SE* and *App.* or Epitomes IIIb or IIIc: *App.* A8\* is copied in *B*, chap. 231 (fol. 80–80v), and *Z*, 2.156 (fol. 90–90v); *App.* A45\* and the end of *App.* A44\*, contracted, in *B*, chap. 217 (fol. 73), and *Z*, 2.142 (fol. 82); *App.* A48\* in *B*, chap. 366a, fol. 145v (where it is incomplete), *Z*, 2.320 (fol. 157v), and *H*, chap. A574 (fol. 307); *App.* B70 = Epitome IIIb xv = Epitome IIIc x in *B*, chap. 337 (fols. 132v–133v), and *Z*, 2.287 (fols. 146v–147); “Balchus” 50\* in *B*, chap. 257 (fol. 100), and *Z*, 2.190 (fols. 114v–115); and “Balchus” 67\* in *B*, chap. 205 (fol. 68–68v), and *Z*, 2.130 (fol. 76v). The chapters that have already appeared in the comparison of nn. 34 and 35 above are asterisked.

41 Pingree raised this possibility only cautiously in “Antiochus and Rhetorius,” 222, but more directly in “From Alexandria to Baghdad,” 11.

42 *SE* 21, p. 241.17 Cu, and 22, p. 244.18 Cu, refer to “chapter 16,” which is in fact *SE* 14; and *SE* 22, p. 243.20 Cu, refers to “chapter 15,” which is really *SE* 12. The cross-references to *SE* 1 (which corresponds to *ME* 57) are in *SE* 22, pp. 246.22 and 247.5 Cu, where it is referred to as “chapter 5”; the cross-reference to *SE* 4 (which corresponds to *ME* 61–62) is in *SE* 22, p. 246.16–17 Cu, as “καθὼς καὶ προεγράψαμεν.” There is a reference to an upcoming chapter, *SE* 23 (“καθὼς μετὰ ταῦτα διδάξομεν”), in *SE* 22, p. 244.15–16 Cu.

43 These were tentatively dated to 1 May 516, 15 December 400 or 11 January 401, and 2 April 488 (Horr. gr. 516.V.12, 400–401?, and 488?, respectively) in O. Neugebauer and H. B. van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes* (Philadelphia, 1959), 157, 134, 151, but virtually the same problems occur as in the case of the “horoscope” in *ME* 110: the data, which are extensively used and therefore cannot be convincingly emended, do not correspond with any calculated celestial alignment; see *ibid.*, 158, 134, 152, and Jones, “Ancient Rejection,” 44, 63.

44 Horr. gr. 428.IX.8 and 482.III.21.

45 Dykes, *The Astrology of Sahl b. Bisr* (n. 22 above), 265–70.



feature suggests that besides the above-mentioned *App.* A17, some further chapters of *App.* may once have been a part of the original compendium.<sup>48</sup>

### *The Chapters on the Zodiacal Signs and the Planets*

Several other manuscripts contain a few chapters corresponding to those found in *ME*. One of them, Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Phillips 1577 (gr. 173; hereafter *D*), has *ME* 1 under the title Ἐπίλυσις καὶ διήγησις πάντων τῶν προειρημένων (Explanation and interpretation of all the matters stated beforehand—a title reminiscent of that of *ME*, its summary, and Epitome IIIb) on fols. 145v–146v.<sup>49</sup> This must be a reference to the preceding two chapters (fols. 139–144v and 144v–145v) copied by the same scribe; these chapters describe the zodiacal signs and planets, respectively. (In the following discussion, I will refer to them as *Signs* and *Plan.*)<sup>50</sup>

There are a few testimonies that confirm that these two chapters once belonged to the front matter of the compendium:

- Several cross-references in *ME* link *Signs* and *Plan.* to it.<sup>51</sup> From the language of these cross-references, it is also obvious that both *Signs* and *Plan.* preceded the text of *ME* in the original compendium.
- The eminent fixed stars and their longitudes calculated for 504 and described in *ME* 58 are also listed with the same values in *Signs*.

48 Further peculiarities of minor importance: *SE* 22 reappears in a revised version as *B*, chap. 218 (fols. 73v–74); *Z*, 2.143 (fols. 82–83); and *H*, chap. A229 (fol. 170–170v); a variant of *SE* 3—which corresponds to *ME* 59–60—is found as *B*, chap. 364 (fols. 142v–145), and *Z*, 2.314–317 (fols. 155–157); and an inferior version of *SE* 16 reappears as *B*, chap. 229 (fol. 79–79v), and *Z*, 2.154 (fol. 89).

49 *D* also contains a table of contents on fols. 43–47v, a part of which, until fol. 47, overlaps the content of two manuscripts of *SE*: *B*, chaps. 1–374 and 498 (fols. 1–148v and 191) and *Z*, 1.<0>–2.334 (fols. 5v–163 and 205v); also, on fols. 48–49v, an incomplete copy of *SE* 1, attributed to Hermes Trismegistus as in *H*, is found. These chapters were copied into *D* in the fifteenth century.

50 *Signs* was edited by F. Boll in *CCAG* 7:192–213, and *Plan.* by Boll in *CCAG* 7:213–24, by conflating the readings of *D*, *X*, and *U* (in the editions *R*, *V*, and *T*, respectively).

51 *ME* 4, p. 146.15–19 Bo; 11, p. 220.10 BW; and 12, p. 221.16 BW, apparently refer to *Signs*. *ME* 9, p. 149.7 Bo, refers to *Plan.*, p. 214.11 Bo, and 11, p. 220.14 BW, to *Plan.*, p. 219.12–13 Bo.

- Two asterisms, the Pleiades and the Beehive Cluster, are listed in both *ME* 62 and *Signs*;<sup>52</sup> the positions are rounded to the integer in *Signs*, but (apart from a possible scribal error) the longitudes agree.

*Signs* and *Plan.* are found under various titles in many more manuscripts. The most important are Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 191 (hereafter *X*; *Signs*: fols. 232v–236v; *Plan.*: fols. 236v–239—chapters copied in the early fourteenth century); the fifteenth-century Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, philosophicus graecus 108 (hereafter *U*; *Signs*: chap. 88 on fols. 249v–256; *Plan.*: chap. 89 on fols. 256–258); and Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, Selden Supra 17 (Selden 16; hereafter *T*), a fifteenth-century manuscript of Epitome IIIc, where only *Signs* is found (fols. 133v–135).<sup>53</sup> Apart from a considerably supplemented version compiled by Isidore of Kiev in the fifteenth century,<sup>54</sup> which ultimately derives from the common hyparchetype of *X* *U*, the longest extant recension is in *X*; *X* also contains a variant of *SE* 22–23—which seems to be closer to the original—on fols. 240v–242v.<sup>55</sup> A somewhat shorter

52 *Signs*, pp. 197.7–9 and 200.10–11 Bo, for the Pleiades and the Beehive Cluster, respectively.

53 The following minor recensions are considerably shorter, and they also omit the fixed stars and asterisms. (This list is only preliminary, as many more copies and recensions may be latent.) A radically abbreviated version of *Signs* and *Plan.* is found in Vatican City, BAV, Urbinas gr. 76 (fols. 70–72), and there is a similarly concise version of *Plan.* in Oxford, Bodleian, Canonicus gr. 1 (fol. 19). *Plan.* and *Signs* constitute chaps. 63 and 64, respectively, of an untitled treatise beginning with the words Τῆς οὐρανίας διαθέσεως (hereafter *TOD*), sometimes attributed to Hephaestio of Thebes; it is found in the following manuscripts: *H* (chaps. B62–63 on fols. 392–394); Vienna, ÖNB, phil. gr. 37 (fols. 261–262v); Oxford, Bodleian, Cromwell 12 (pp. 477–79); and Paris, BNF, gr. 2509 (only the end of chap. 64 is preserved on fol. 131–131v). Chap. 63 (*Plan.*) is also copied in a more abbreviated form in Oxford, Bodleian, Barocci 94 (fols. 112v–113), which on fol. 113v also excerpts the co-rising stars and constellations from a fuller version of *Signs* than that of *TOD*; according to F. Boll, *Sphaera* (Leipzig, 1903), 467–69 (where the text is edited as Excerpt II on 465–66), it is closest to the recensions of *X* *U*.

54 Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 1698 (fols. 73–104); its various readings as well as the additions, borrowed from a Greek version of the ninth-century Abū Ma'shar's *Kitāb taḥāwīl sinī al-mawālīd* (Book of the revolutions of the years of the nativities), were published by Weinstock in *CCAG* 5.4:123–52.

55 These chapters were copied, but not directly from *X*, in a revised form by Isaac Argyrus in Paris, BNF, gr. 2507 (fol. 103–103v); regrettably, the larger part of *SE* 23 is now lost. Curiously, portions also survive as interlinear and marginal notes as well as filling in a lacuna

recension is found in *U*, where *Signs* is preceded by *ME* 2 on fol. 249–249v;<sup>56</sup> the many parallels between *X* and *U* imply they had a common hyparchetype, which was also the source for Isidore of Kiev.

However promising this abundance of variants may appear, we can conclude from a comparison of the major recensions that each of the extant variants was revised.<sup>57</sup>

- In *Signs*, *XU* include the exaltations (ὑψώματα) and depressions (ταπεινώματα or κοιλώματα) of the lunar nodes, a theory first attested in Sassanian astrology,<sup>58</sup> but *D*, faithful to the original, does not.
- *XU* give the common (ἐπίκοινος) planetary lords of the sign trigons, which were used by mainstream astrologers and are also invoked in *ME* 10; *D*, following Ptolemy's differing views (Ptol. *Tetr.* 1.19), omits them.
- *XU* list the standard bound (ῥοιᾶ) system of the planets (called “Egyptian” by Ptolemy); *D* only asserts in the Aries section (p. 195, app. crit. ad 14 Bo) that the bound systems according to Ptolemy and the Egyptians, the bright degrees, and the rising times of the climes will be described later.<sup>59</sup> Then, in the Taurus section (p. 197, app. crit. ad 17–19 Bo), *D* repeats that the bounds and the bright and obscure degrees will be inserted later, and the references are omitted from the Gemini section on. Even though the titles of *ME* 12 and 13 are Περί τῶν

ὁρίων κατ' Αἰγυπτίους καὶ Πτολεμαῖον καὶ λαμπρῶν καὶ σκιερῶν μοιρῶν and Περί τῶν ἀναφορῶν τῶν ζ' κλιμάτων, respectively, they do not contain any tables. Therefore, either *XU* is faithful to the original by including the bounds and remaining silent about the bright and dark degrees, as well as the rising times of the climes, or the tables referred to in *D* were once present between *Signs* and *ME* in the original compendium.<sup>60</sup>

- In *Plan.*, *XU* include the colors, tastes, metals, and senses ruled by the planets, which are all omitted from *D* (as was everything that follows). These significations are based on Valens's lists (Vett. Val. 1.1), however, and were probably copied in their entirety into the original compendium.

Even if these observations prove that in some cases the readings of *D* and in other cases the readings of *XU* are closer to the original, it is impossible to completely reconstruct the original forms of *Signs* and *Plan.* as they were present in the compendium.<sup>61</sup>

Regrettably, *T* is also unhelpful on this issue, since its version of *Signs* contains only the attributes of the zodiacal signs and nothing else—not even the fixed stars and asterisms that would make possible the dating; but at least it is certain that its version is somewhat closer to *XU* than *D*. More important, on fol. 135–135v in *T*, *Signs* is immediately followed by some tables corresponding to *App.* A17–18. The first of these chapters, as has been indicated, is a table of the bright, obscure, void, and dark degrees; the second is a table of the masculine and feminine degrees. If we assume that *T* preserved the original structure—that is, that the first table, probably together with the second, was originally after *Signs* but before *ME* in the compendium—the wording of the reference in *ME* 13 to the first table can

in 1.22 (fols. 30–31) of *Z*, its version of *SE* 22. Although *SE* 22 in this version lacks at least a table (δέλτος) from the end to which there is reference, *SE* 22 and 23 seem to be based on its original. Also, its version of *SE* 22 refers back to a chapter on the “house-ruler of the nativity” (οικοδεσπότης τῆς γενέσεως), which is now probably *SE* 16, but it lacks the other references in *SE* 22 found in *BZH*.

56 *TOD* 65 is a chapter conflated from *ME* 56, 55, and 69 with an appendix, found in the manuscripts mentioned above, n. 53, as well as in Leeds, UL, Brotherton Coll. MS 31/3 (pp. 11–13) and in a revised form in Argyrus's Paris, BNF, gr. 2507 (fols. 47v–48v) and its apograph, Florence, BML, Plut. 28. 14 (fols. 219v–220v).

57 Here I disagree with Pingree, who repeatedly insisted that the version of *D* is the original one; e.g., see Pingree, “From Alexandria to Baghdād” (n. 3 above), 6, 20.

58 E. Raffaelli, “Astrology and Religion in the Zoroastrian Pahlavi Texts,” *JA* 305 (2017): 177 n. 53.

59 In fact, in the Aries section *D* has ὑπετάξαμεν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν, which contradicts the remark that follows in the Taurus section. This contradiction can be resolved if the aorist is emended to the future in the second remark.

60 Note that the instructions of *ME* 13 make the inclusion of a table of the rising times unnecessary: the author discloses that Ptolemy's rising times can be found in his *Πρόχειρος κανὼν* (sic), while the Egyptians' and Valens's rising times are described in Valens's “ἀποτελέσματα” (probably a reference to Vett. Val. 1.6). Essentially the same instructions are repeated in *SE* 22, pp. 245.27–246.5 Cu.

61 The testimonies of the minor recensions are as follows: (1) the Vatican Urbinas manuscript and *TOD* follow *D*; (2) Urbinas and *TOD* do not mention the trigonal lords at all; (3) Urbinas and *TOD* omit the bounds entirely; (4) Urbinas describes only the elemental nature, but *TOD* also adds the parts of the body and the diseases in a fuller form than the other recensions. I have not been able to inspect the Oxford Canonicus manuscript.

be easily explained, for it refers backward, toward the beginning of the work.<sup>62</sup>

In any case, the common hyparchetype of *XU* and Isidorus seems to have contained sections in *Plan.* about the indications of the individual planets when they are assuming lordship over the nativity.<sup>63</sup> Within those sections, the author promises to include the indications of the mutual configurations (συσχηματισμοί) of the planets and their appearances in each other's houses (οἶκοι) in a chapter on the commixtures (συγκράσεις).<sup>64</sup> If these cross-references belong to the original compendium, such passages were also included there.

### *The Relation between the Compendium and the Liber Hermetis*

There remains one text—or rather, anthology—to be examined: the *Liber Hermetis* (hereafter *LH*), an astrological collection of thirty-seven chapters extant in Latin in the fifteenth-century London, British Library, Harley 3731 (fols. 1a–50a) and partly in Old French in the fourteenth-century Paris, BNF, français 613 (fols. 138vb–144b).<sup>65</sup> It was translated from Greek to Latin by a translator competent in the Latin terminology introduced by the twelfth-century translators of Arabic astrological treatises, and therefore the translation itself should be dated to the thirteenth or fourteenth century.<sup>66</sup>

62 The text says καὶ ταύτας (ταῦτα *L*; i.e., λαμπράς καὶ σκιεράς καὶ ἀμυδράς μοίρας) ἐν τοῖς ἔμροσθεν ἡναγκάσθην (-θη *R*) καθυποτάξαι; the aorist must refer backward—not forward, as Pingree, “From Alexandria to Baghdād,” 8, seems to understand it.

63 *Plan.*, pp. 215.5–26 (Saturn), 216.25–217.6 (Jupiter), 218.12–219.3 (Mars), 220.25–221.5 (Venus), and 221.28–222.11 Bo (Mercury). The material is present in *X* and Isidorus but largely omitted from *U*.

64 *Plan.*, pp. 215.24–26 (Saturn), 217.5–6 (Jupiter), 219.2–3 (Mars), 221.4–5 (Venus), and 221.29–30 Bo (Mercury).

65 *Liber Hermetis* was most recently edited in Feraboli, *De triginta sex decanis* (n. 5 above). Investigating the traces of the identified constituents of the compendium in later literature—e.g., in the works of Theophilus of Edessa, Māshā'allāh, Abū Ma'shar, and others—is possible but beyond the scope of the present article.

66 Apart from the presence of the originally Perso-Arabic *ilegia* in *LH* 15.123, the choice of words such as *domus*, *triplicitas*, etc. is also telling. For the demonstration that the text was translated directly from Greek, see Feraboli, *De triginta sex decanis*, xxii–xxiv; the thirteenth century for the date of the translation is also suggested by the activity during that period of two notable translators of Greek astrological texts into Latin, William of Moerbeke and Stephen of Messina.

Consisting of chapters of various origin, including direct translations from Valens, *LH* has a few chapters that can be paralleled with those of *ME*, *App.*, and *Signs*.<sup>67</sup> For this reason, Pingree assumed that it constituted yet another epitome of the compendium, and he labeled it Epitome V. However, apart from *LH* 16, which is a rearranged version of *ME* 54, and *LH* 19, which corresponds to *ME* 97, the structures of the chapters of *LH* and those of *ME* and *App.* differ greatly.<sup>68</sup>

This feature is attested most conspicuously in *LH* 25, a lengthy text describing the parts of the twelve zodiacal signs and the constellations and notable fixed stars co-rising with them.<sup>69</sup> It was assembled from six or, more likely, seven sources, some of which can be paralleled with *Signs*, *App.* A17, and *ME*.<sup>70</sup> Still, while the stellar positions in *ME* 58 and *Signs* are calculated for 504, the longitudes of the same stars in *LH* 25 are correct for 480.<sup>71</sup> Incidentally, the catalogue of stars and asterisms that are harmful for the eyes in *ME* 62—two entries from which, the Pleiades and the Beehive Cluster, also appear in *Signs* (pp. 197.7–9, 200.10–11 Bo)—is also calculated for 480; so are the two stars, Zavijava and Vindemiatrix in their modern designations, added in the Virgo section of *Signs* (p. 203.4–9 Bo). This internal

67 For the sources and parallels (apart from chaps. 1, 3, and 25), see Feraboli, *De triginta sex decanis*, x–xi.

68 *LH* 3.18–19 and 21 correspond to a few sentences from *App.* A5a, attributed to Serapio there; *LH* 20.1–2 is a translation of the beginning of *ME* 98, but the continuation differs; *LH* 21.1–3 is a shortened version of *ME* 101; *LH* 29 corresponds to much of *ME* 59, slightly rearranged, but each contains sentences not found in the other version; *LH* 30.1–9 corresponds to the second half of *ME* 103 and its beginning, between which a section from *ME* 48 is inserted; and *LH* 37 is gathered from an abbreviated, slightly confused version of *ME* 104, a statement that already occurred in *LH* 19 and the corresponding *ME* 97, and a section of *ME* 48.

69 This text is edited, analyzed, and commented on by W. Hübner, *Grade und Gradbezirke der Tierkreiszeichen* (Leipzig, 1995); cf. D. Pingree's review in *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 6.3 (1999): 473–76.

70 The description of the co-rising constellations follows the pattern of *Signs* only from 16 Aquarius; see Hübner, *Grade und Gradbezirke*, 1:126–27. Still, the bright, obscure, void, and dark degrees are the same as in *App.* A17 (and in the corresponding chapter of *T*), and the lascivious degrees of *ME* 67 are also found; see Feraboli, *De triginta sex decanis*, 309–11, and Hübner, *Grade und Gradbezirke*, 1:136.

71 See above, n. 14. The difference between *LH* and Ptolemy's catalogue is 3° 26', which corresponds to 343½ years; when added to Ptolemy's epoch, the result is 480.

discrepancy in *ME* and *Signs* has not been adequately explained; it is very likely that for the fixed stars and asterisms, the author of the compendium relied on a source composed in 480 but only partly updated the longitudes for his era, for reasons unknown.

Nevertheless, as *LH* 25 has an earlier and fuller version of the stellar catalogue than *ME* 58 does, at least this section of *LH* could not have been epitomized from the compendium; the most plausible scenario is that *LH* preserved the source in some form. If so, the other parts of *LH* that are paralleled in the compendium may also exhibit this earlier stage.

### *The Reconstructible Content and Date of the Compendium*

The observations made so far can be summarized as follows. There existed an astrological compendium—probably titled Ἐπίλυσις καὶ διήγησις πάσης ἀστρονομικῆς τέχνης (Explanation and interpretation of all astrology), as *ME*, its summary (Epitome IIIa), and *D* suggest—to which the following excerpts can be assigned:

- I The compendium seems to have begun with a description of the zodiacal signs and the planets. The original form of these chapters cannot be reconstructed convincingly, for each of the extant recensions of *Signs* and *Plan.* was revised.
- II Possibly after the description of the zodiacal signs, there was a table of the bright, obscure, void, and dark degrees, which may have been followed by another table of the masculine and feminine degrees. Both these tables are extant in *R* as *App.* A17–18 and on fol. 135–135v of *T*; the first one is also found embedded in *LH* 25. Tables of the bounds and the rising times of the climes might have been also included here.
- III This introductory section was probably followed by a genethliological treatise, which is now the incomplete *ME* in *R*.
- IV Within this treatise, sections on various astrological calculations, predictive methods, the strategical analysis of nativities, and the topics of the length of life and conception were also found—these are missing in *ME* but preserved to some extent as *SE* 12–23. Probably there were also a few more chapters, referred to in *SE* but now lost, such as

ones devoted to nonviable nativities, the periods of life and premature death, and the indications of the contacts and defluxions of the planets. However, it is not known how extensively the text of *SE* was revised; in any case, the version of *SE* 22–23 preserved in *X* and the manuscripts related to it seems to be the closest to the original.

- V The genethliological treatise appears to have concluded with the nativities of Pamprepius of Panopolis (now *ME* 113–17), the unnamed son of the emperor Leo I (the interpretation of which was presumably less concise than the only extant version, *SE* 28a), and at least one more royal nativity. It is not known where the nativities of 428 and 482 were included and whether the casebook examples also contained the three other fifth-century nativities preserved in Māshā' allāh's and al-Khayyāt's genethliological books.

Somewhat tentatively, other texts can be added to this reconstruction:

- VI A chapter on the commixtures—the mutual configurations of the planets and their appearances in each other's houses—indicated in *Plan.* in the versions of *X* and Isidorus; and
- VII Possibly further genethliological and catarchic chapters; the most likely candidates for these are the ones found in *App.* or Epitomes IIIb or IIIc on the one hand, and in “Balchus,” *V*, or the manuscripts of *SE* on the other.<sup>72</sup>

As for dating, there are two pieces of evidence to be considered: the latest cited author is Julianus of Laodicea (*ME* 58, although his name is only supplied in *SE* 2),<sup>73</sup> who lived and worked in the late fifth century;<sup>74</sup> and the latest datable parts, *Signs* and *ME* 58, are dated to 504.

<sup>72</sup> See the survey of these candidates above, nn. 34, 35, and 47.

<sup>73</sup> *App.* A42–51 is a block of excerpts from Julianus's work on inceptions, many of which also appear in “Balchus,” *V*, and the manuscripts of *SE*. It is tempting to assume that these chapters also belonged to the compendium, perhaps in a fuller form, but this hypothesis cannot be proven.

<sup>74</sup> Julianus cites the commentary by Proclus (412–485) to Plotinus in *App.* A44, also extant as “Balchus” 77. The chapter was edited by Cumont in *CCAG* 5,1:187–93; see esp. 189.28–190.5.



Since the work would be translated to Middle Persian with no updates to the stellar data, and outdated stellar positions yield nothing worthwhile for the practicing astrologer, the compendium was likely published in 504 or shortly thereafter.

## Rhetorius and Zeno's Astrologer

### *The Emperor Zeno's Astrologer*

In his 1976 article, after examining six fifth-century political horoscopes, Pingree concluded that they were devised or transmitted by an obscure person (henceforth called Anon.) whose identity is unknown but who apparently worked for the emperor Zeno.<sup>75</sup> Two of his horoscopes, the nativities of Pamprepus and of the unnamed son of the emperor Leo I, were found in the compendium.<sup>76</sup> While it could be argued that they were merged with the theoretical chapters only by a later redactor, Pamprepus's nativity at least appears to be strongly connected to the theoretical parts of the compendium, suggesting that Anon. was author of the entire work. To assess the plausibility of this assumption, we must first ascertain Anon.'s era. Doing so is possible because the remaining four political horoscopes are inceptions—that is, horoscopes associated with contemporary events.

Although Pingree attributed only four inceptions to Anon., the sources containing them yield ten fifth-century inceptions in total. Their most extensive reservoir, chapter 164 of *U* on fols. 299r–301v, is a collection of seven case horoscopes. The last of them is the nativity of Hadrian, originally devised by Antigonus of Nicaea, but the variant in *U* is a reworked version from Hephaestio of Thebes' exposition.<sup>77</sup> The remaining horoscopes are all fifth-century inceptions.

Six of the horoscopes of *U*, including Hadrian's nativity, are also found in book IV of Paris, BNF, gr. 2419 (hereafter *G*), a manuscript copied by George Madiates around 1461. Four horoscopes of *U*, including the case omitted in *G*, appear in "Balchus," whose primary manuscripts are Rome, Biblioteca Angelica,

gr. 29 (hereafter *E*), copied by Eleutherius of Elis in Mytilene in 1388, and Milan, Veneranda Biblioteca Ambrosiana, B 38 sup. (Martini–Bassi 88; hereafter *A*), copied in the fifteenth century.<sup>78</sup> Here two more fifth-century inceptions emerge. These two inceptions together with two others already known from *U* and *G* are present in *Kitāb masā'il fī 'ilm aḥkām al-nujūm* (Book of astrological inquiries), written by the late ninth-century Perso-Arabic astrologer al-Qaṣrānī.<sup>79</sup> This Arabic compilation, which contains yet two more fifth-century inceptions, whose original Greek versions are lost, is apparently based on a Middle Persian intermediary (so the usage of the Persianate name of Mars, *Bahrām*, for the common Arabic *al-Mirrikh* suggests). The horoscopes in their reconstructed order and their sources can be tabulated as shown in table 5.<sup>80</sup>

78 For the current views on "Balchus" (certainly not a fifth-century astrologer, as supposed by earlier research) and his work, see D. Pingree, "The Astrological School of John Abramius," *DOP* 25 (1971): 203–4, and idem, *From Astral Omens to Astrology: From Babylon to Bīnāker* (Rome, 1997), 75–76. Nonetheless, two corrections must be made to Pingree's thesis. (1) Eleutherius of Elis, who was active in the late fourteenth century, is not identical with Ἐλευθέριος ὁ Ζεβελήνης—that is, the twelfth-century Eleutherius of Gabala, whose universal interrogation (a horoscope cast for an unknown nativity) was rightly dated to 11 October 1164 in G. Bezza, "Il trattato sulle natività di Eleuterio Zebeleno di Elis," *MHNH* 2 (2002): 299–300, superseding the dating to 10 November 1343 in D. Pingree, "The Horoscope of Constantinople," in *ΠΡΟΣΜΑΤΑ*, ed. Y. Maeyama and W. G. Saltzer (Wiesbaden, 1977), 314. (2) Since the differences between the two primary manuscripts exclude the possibility that *A* was copied from Eleutherius's *E* (as indicated in Pingree, "Astrological School," 203, 57), Eleutherius could not have forged the "Balchus" text. Also, the name form Μπαλχος attested on fol. 146v of *A* better represents the Arabic ethnonym al-Balkhī phonologically; therefore, I suggest the name form "Balchus" be preferred to the commonly used "Palchus." In *EA*, this Αποτελεσματική βιβλος—in fact, an anthology of chapters originally written in or translated to Greek—appears together with a work of three books titled Μυστήρια (Secrets) and attributed to Abū Ma'shar, whose ethnonym (*nisba*) is "al-Balkhī"; therefore, it is likely that the copyist of the archetype assumed, wrongly, that the Αποτελεσματική βιβλος had been also authored by Abū Ma'shar.

79 See F. Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, vol. 7, *Astrologie, Meteorologie und Verwandtes bis ca. 430 H.* (Leiden, 1979), 138–39.

80 All the cases have been edited, but none using every available manuscript. Cases VII, IX–X, VIII, I, and V were edited from *E* by Cumont in *CCAG* 1:100–101, 102–4, and 106–8 (cf. the additions and corrections on 175); the various readings of case VII, case I from *U*, cases II–III from *G* and *U*, and case V from *U* were edited by W. Kroll and Cumont in *CCAG* 6:63–67. Pingree, "Political Horoscopes,"

75 Pingree, "Political Horoscopes" (n. 5 above), 133–50.

76 Hor. gr. 440.IX.29 in *ME* 113–17 and Hor. gr. 463.IV.25 in *SE* 28a.

77 See the discussion and edition (as Excerpt I) in Heilen, *Hadriani genitura* (n. 2 above), 94–110, 128–43.

Table 5. Horoscopes Attributable to Zeno's Astrologer

No.	Case	Designation	Sources			
			<i>U</i>	<i>G</i>	"Balchus"	al-Qaṣrānī
I	A distressing letter contrary to the receiver's expectations	Hor. gr. 487.IX.5	164, no. 1	4.15	87	—
II	A linen cloth lost	Hor. gr. 478.VIII.29	164, no. 2	4.31	—	—
III	The taming of a lion cub	Hor. gr. 483.VII.8	164, no. 3	4.34	—	—
IV	The coronation [of Basiliscus]	Hor. gr. 475.I.12	—	—	—	10.3.2, no. 6
V	The coronation of Leontius	Hor. gr. 484.VII.18	164, no. 4	—	88	10.3.2, no. 7
VI	The [consular] installation [of Theoderic]	Hor. gr. 483.IV.9	—	—	—	10.3.2, no. 8
VII	The entrance of Theodorus the augustalian prefect in Alexandria	Hor. gr. 486.III.17	164, no. 5	4.35	31	—
VIII	Fear about a ship sailing from Alexandria to Smyrna	Hor. gr. 479.VII.14	164, no. 6	4.36	59	1.3, no. 1
IX	A voyage from Caesarea [Maritima]	Hor. gr. 474.X.1	—	—	57	1.3, no. 2
X	Fear about a ship sailing to Athens	Hor. gr. 475.VII.16	—	—	58	1.3, no. 3

Because cases IV–VII as well as the nativities of Pamprepus and of the son of Leo I are related to the politics of the emperor Zeno's era, Pingree was led to assume that they belonged to Anon. However, he left open the question of whether the remaining inceptiones should be attributed to the same astrologer.<sup>81</sup> Others endorsed this possibility with various levels of confidence, but the positive evidence has not been systematically explored.<sup>82</sup> Here I summarize the most important observations:

- While only cases IV–VII are strictly political, the lion cub of case III was a gift sent by a *consul designatus* to a consul, most probably by Theoderic to Zeno himself; and the letter of case I could be easily an official letter, perhaps related to the blockade of Constantinople in the fall of 487 by Theoderic.

published cases IV–VI from two manuscripts of al-Qaṣrānī (there are about thirty known manuscripts) and reedited cases V from *E U* and VII from *E G U*. Finally, Heilen, *Hadriani genitura*, 105, provided a partial edition of case VIII (corresponding to p. 104.23–24 Cu) from *E G U*, and added remarks on cases I, V, and VII.

81 Pingree, "Political Horoscopes," 150.

82 For a previous assessment, see Heilen, *Hadriani genitura*, 98–102, esp. 98 n. 413, and 1383–85. In the survey that follows, I have omitted some of Heilen's observations that I found to be of minor importance.

- The presentation of the data is uniform in the Greek original: the calendrical data using the Alexandrian month (except for case IX) and, occasionally, the planetary lord of the day are followed by the positions of the sun, the moon, the planets from Saturn to Mercury, the ascendant and the midheaven, the ascending lunar node, the previous lunation, the lot of fortune (these two are swapped in case I), and other lots when they seem relevant. The longitudes are mostly rounded to the integer, save for cases VII and IX, where they are rounded to half degrees, and for case I, where minutes are also used. The longitudes and the angles are calculated using Ptolemy's parameters and tables.
- The language used in the cases that are extant in their original Greek is consistent; e.g., a planet's position in a specific "topical place" (τόπος, the equivalent of the astrological "house" of Arabic and later astrology) is largely expressed with a dedicated verb, such as ἀγαθοδαιμονεῖν for the eleventh place, called Ἀγαθὸς Δαίμων, in cases I, III, and VII.<sup>83</sup>
- Similar astrological techniques are utilized throughout; these include the use of unusual and rarely encountered concepts and conditions, such as the

83 Case I, p. 106.10–11 Cu = p. 64.3 CK; case III, p. 66.7 CK; case VII, p. 100.12 Cu = p. 148.2 P.

third and seventh day of the moon in cases I, III, and VIII,<sup>84</sup> and the “intervention” (μεσεμβολία) of the sun in cases I and V.<sup>85</sup>

- Previous literature, such as the “ancient astrologers” (ἀρχαῖοι), Dorotheus, and Antigonos, are referred to or, in the case of Dorotheus, even paraphrased or cited in cases I, V, and X.<sup>86</sup>

These arguments seem compelling enough to prove that the entire catarchic casebook—which may well have contained further cases, now lost—was authored by a single person who was active between 474 and 487. The nativity of Leo I's son also suggests that this person had probably been employed by Zeno as early as 463.

### *Zeno's Astrologer and the Compendium*

To show that the period of Anon.'s attestable activity does not preclude the possibility that he published a compendium in or shortly after 504, the links that connect Anon.'s cases and the compendium must be scrutinized. The most compelling evidence is provided by Anon.'s case horoscopes that refer to certain rare or unique concepts or conditions that also appear in the theoretical chapters of the compendium:

- In the Pamprepis nativity (*ME* 113, p. 222.23 Cu = p. 145.32 P), the nearly exact conjunction of Mercury with Jupiter is called “being in the heart” (ἐγκάρδιος); this designation is known only from *ME* 2 (p. 145.25–26 Bo).
- The “twelfth-parts” (δωδεκατημόρια) are used in cases I, III, and VIII; of the two known variants, the one attributed to Dorotheus and Ptolemy and recommended in *ME* 19 is used.<sup>87</sup>

84 Case I, p. 106.12 Cu = p. 64.4 CK; case III, p. 66.8–9 CK; case VIII, p. 104.8 Cu. For the doctrine, see Heilen, *Hadriani gentitura*, 895–978, esp. 922–23.

85 See also below, nn. 94 and 105.

86 Case I, p. 107.2 Cu = p. 64.12 CK (Dorotheus), and p. 107.4 Cu = p. 64.14 CK and p. 107.13 Cu = p. 64.23 CK (Antigonos); case V, p. 108.5–15 Cu = p. 67.8–17 CK = pp. 140–41.17–26 P (Dorotheus, with citation); case X, p. 103.20 Cu (Dorotheus) and p. 103.30 Cu (ἀρχαῖοι).

87 Case I, p. 106.12 Cu = 64.5 CK; case III, p. 66.4 CK; case VIII, p. 104.9 Cu. In case III, the moon's twelfth-part is said to fall in a four-footed zodiacal sign. The moon's position is erroneously given and used throughout as 10 Aquarius (although it should be 13 Aquarius): the Dorotheus–Ptolemy method yields 30 Taurus for the twelfth-part,

- The scarcely attested condition “neighboring,” ὁμορ(ρ)όησις, is referred to in case II (p. 65.16 CK). Originating from Antiochus (epitome of the *Εἰσαγωγικά*, p. 114.17–19 Cu), it is described only in Porph. *In Ptol.* 22 (from where it is copied into Isaac Argyrus's version of Heph. Astr. 1.16)<sup>88</sup> and *ME* 40; it is also referred to in Psell. *Or. fun.* 3.26.7 Polemis.<sup>89</sup>
- In the Pamprepis nativity, in cases IV and VII and probably case V, a degree-based calculation appears for the topical places;<sup>90</sup> such methods are described in *ME* 46 and *SE* 12, and recommended in *SE* 22 (p. 243.18–21 Cu, also in the version of X).
- In case III (p. 66.8 CK), the technical verb ἐκδέχεσθαι is used to express “(for a planet) to receive the contact (συναφή) or presence (παρουσία) of the moon”; this expression appears only in *ME* 57.5 (pp. 153.10 and 154.10 Cu) and 57.11 (pp. 172.6 and 174.8 Cu); *App.* A23 and A23a;<sup>91</sup> and Isaac Argyrus's version of Heph. Astr. 3.40.21–22, which is Epitome IV 118.21–22, p. 324.11–15 P.

while the alternative method (of Paulus of Alexandria) would produce 10 Gemini, certainly not a four-footed sign.

88 It was edited by C.-É. Ruelle in *CCAG* 8.2:48–49, esp. 49.

89 In case II and Argyrus's text, it is written ὁμοίωσις, but what is meant is without question ὁμορ(ρ)όησις, which happens when two planets are in the same planet's bound while they are joined bodily or in a configuration: in this particular case, which is the only known practical application of neighboring, the moon forms a tetragonal figure with Mars while both of them are in the bounds of Mars.

90 See *ME* 113, pp. 221.13–222.2 Cu = p. 144.11–14 P, for Pamprepis's nativity as well as p. 137.3–4 P for case IV (Venus in the eleventh zodiacal sign but in the tenth place) and p. 101.1–2 Cu = p. 148.1–4 P and p. 101.10 Cu = p. 149.1–2 P for case VII (Venus in the twelfth sign but in the eleventh place). In case V, the text of p. 108.1–3 Cu = p. 67.3–5 CK = p. 140.13–15 P, τὴν Σελήνην . . . ταπεινουμένην καὶ κακοδαμονούσαν, should be emended to ταπειδουμένην καὶ <τὸν κύριον αὐτῆς Ἄρην> κακοδαμονοῦντα, since the moon is in the fifth sign and place while Mars is in the first sign but in the twelfth place; this emendation presupposes the correction of the erroneous longitude given to Mars in accordance with the logic of the text. Conversely, in case VI, the text of p. 142.17–18 P, *wa-biya* . . . *fī wasat al-samā' ya nī al-Zubra* (and she, that is, Venus was . . . in the midheaven), should be emended to *fī <mā yalī> wasat al-samā'* (in what follows the midheaven), for Venus is in the eleventh sign and place.

91 *App.* A23 was edited from *V* by J. Heeg in *CCAG* 5.3:126–27 and from *A* and El Escorial, RB, Φ. I. 5 (Andrés 183), an apograph of *E*, by C. O. Zuretti in *CCAG* 11.1:270–71; the expression is on p. 126.19 He = p. 270.20 Zu. *App.* A23a is unedited.

- In the nativity of 482 (*SE* 19, p. 240.22 Cu) and case VIII (p. 104.14 Cu), the technical verb ὑποδέχσθαι is used to mean “(for a planet) to receive (another planet in one’s own house, bounds, trigon, or exaltation),” a meaning attested only in Paul. Al. 24 (p. 72.8 Boer), Olymp. in Paul. 11 (p. 19.19 Boer), and *ME* 66 (corresponding to *SE* 7; p. 195.7 Cu), 82 (p. 209.3 Cu), 84 (p. 214.15 Cu), and 85 (p. 214.20 Cu).
- However, the most compelling evidence is the reliance on the co-rising constellations of Scorpio, Asclepius, and Hygieia in case VIII (p. 104.21 and 30 C); these are mentioned only in *Signs*, p. 205.20–22 Bo; *LH* 25.8.10; and *App.* A7.<sup>92</sup>

Conversely, at first glance there seem to be two discrepancies between the names of certain conditions in Anon.’s inceptions and the compendium. In cases I and V a condition called “intervention” (μεσεμβολία) is mentioned,<sup>93</sup> but it is hardly identical with the μεσεμβόλησις as defined in *ME* 36a.<sup>94</sup> Similarly, in case I a condition called “confinement”

(ἐμπεριοχή) is identified,<sup>95</sup> which is also different from the ἐμπερίσχεσις of *ME* 41.<sup>96</sup>

However, these apparent disagreements can be reconciled if we assume that in referring to particular conditions, Anon. consciously employed distinct terms that are used by other authors differently than by Antiochus. In case I,<sup>97</sup> the sun’s intervention is qualified with καθώς φησιν Δωρόθεος (p. 107.2 Cu = p. 64.12 CK). It must be a reference to Dorotheus 3.2.29, within a casebook nativity,<sup>98</sup> where the sun intervenes in the same way. Intervention seems to be understood in the same manner in Vett. Val. 2.31.17–19 as well. To the confinement executed by the rays of the malefics in case I is also appended the remark καθώς διδάσκει Ἀντίγονος (p. 107.4 Cu = p. 64.14 CK); the same type of confinement occurs in Antigonos frag. 1, p. 156.8–11 Heilen. The confinement of Venus by Mars in case I remains unexplained, but we can assume that the technical terms used in the casebook inceptions with different meanings were addressed in the theoretical part of the book on inceptions that is now lost.

92 *App.* A7 was edited from *V* and a manuscript of Epitome IIIb, Munich, BSB, Cod. graec. 287, in Boll, *Sphaera* (n. 53 above), 57–58, esp. 58.19–22; for these references, see also Hübner, *Grade und Gradbezirke* (n. 69 above), 1:120–21, 2:65. The full text of this section of *Signs* is extant only in *D*, but Abū Ma’shar’s *Kitāb al-mudkhal al-kabīr* (Great introductory book) 6.1.39a and 40a, which derives from *Signs*, also contains these two constellations—provided that the corrupt reading of the manuscripts, which appears in the edition of K. Yamamoto and C. Burnett (*The Great Introduction to Astrology*, 2 vols. [Leiden, 2019], 1:582.7) as *al-Šinja*, is correctly emended to *al-Šihha* (= Hygieia).

93 This is the right reading of *E* in case I (p. 107.6 Cu); *G U* write μεσεμβολή (p. 64.16 CK), while *A* writes μεσεμβόλησις. In the other instances, verbal forms derived from μεσεμβόλειν are used: p. 107.1 Cu = p. 64.11 CK for case I, and p. 107.16 Cu = p. 67.2–3 CK = p. 140.13 P for case V, where in Cumont’s and Pingree’s editions ἐπεμβόλει, the faulty reading of *E*—and *A*—is adopted.

94 This μεσεμβόλησις, also defined in Ps.-Porph. *In Ptol.* 16, probably originates from Antiochus, though its definition is missing from the extant summary of his *Εισαγωγικά*. It occurs when two planets are about to make a contact (συναφή) but a third planet casts its ray on one of the intermediate degrees; μεσεμβολία, however, is understood simply as a third planet taking its place in the zodiac between two planets. In these cases the third planet is the sun, but the theoretical possibility of the intervention of other planets is also mentioned in case I (p. 107.6 Cu = p. 64.16 CK). See also below, n. 105.

95 The nominal form occurs only in p. 107.7 Cu = p. 64.17 CK; in the other instances (p. 107.3, 9, 12 Cu = p. 64.13, 19, 22 CK), derivations from the verb ἐμπεριέχειν are used.

96 According to the definition of ἐμπερίσχεσις, which derives from Antiochus (cf. epitome of the *Εισαγωγικά* 1.12, p. 114.23–27 Cu), two planets confine the third one if they are before and after it in an interval of 7 degrees, without any other planet casting its rays on the intermediate degrees; this is nearly identical with the first definition given in Ps.-Porph. *In Ptol.* 15. However, the condition called ἐμπεριοχή in case I has two different meanings: (1) When two planets cast their rays before and after a third planet (here Saturn and Mars cast their tetragonal rays on 16 Virgo and 8 Libra, respectively, while Mercury, the ascendant, the moon, and Jupiter are confined in 25 Virgo and 1, 4, and 8 Libra, respectively); this is nearly identical with the second definition given by Porphyry. (2) When a planet is in the sixth zodiacal sign counted inclusively from another planet’s sign, and therefore is confined between its diametrical and trigonal rays (here Venus in Leo is in the sixth sign from Mars in Capricorn, and therefore is confined between its rays cast in Cancer and Virgo); this is identical with the third definition of Porphyry, which refers back to *In Ptol.* 14. In this case, my interpretation differs from the one expounded in Heilen, *Hadriani genitura*, 518.

97 On p. 107.2 Cu, Jupiter is written, erroneously. In fact, *G U* write Mars (cf. p. 64.12 CK), while *AE* give the sun (which is also consistent with Dorotheus).

98 Hor. gr. 44.X.2, also extant in *Liber Aristotilis* 3.1.10.31 (Burnett and Pingree, *The Liber Aristotilis* [n. 13 above], 44, 144). This link between Anon. and Dorotheus confirms that the horoscope is original, not a Sassanian interpolation; cf. Heilen, *Hadriani genitura*, 221–22.



In conclusion, these data strongly suggest that the author of the compendium was Anon.,<sup>99</sup> and the presence of politically sensitive case horoscopes also explains why it was published well after Zeno's death in 491. Until now, however, this possible attribution has not been considered, for the scholarly consensus—shaped by the opinions of Franz Boll, Franz Cumont, and David Pingree—has viewed Rhetorius of Egypt as the compendium's author.

### *The Fragments of Rhetorius*

When Franz Boll published *ME* 1–53 in 1898, he gave a partial list of manuscripts that contain the text under the title Ῥητορίου Ἐκθεσις καὶ ἐπίλυσις περὶ τε τῶν προειρημένων δώδεκα ζῳδίων καὶ περὶ ἐτέρων διαφόρων ἐκ τῶν Ἀντιόχου Θησαυρῶν (Rhetorius's exposition and explanation of the aforementioned twelve zodiacal signs and various other matters from Antiochus's *Treasures*; hereafter Rhetorius's Exc. I).<sup>100</sup> The manuscripts of this text, which covers most of units A B of *ME* but in fact gives no description of the zodiacal signs, include a few that constitute a subbranch within branch γ of the manuscripts of Paulus of Alexandria's introductory work and others whose affiliations cannot be ascertained. They also include *H* (chaps. A 442–457 on fols. 249v–251r), where the text is incomplete, and *U*,

99 The acceptance of Anon.'s authorship allows a further tentative conjecture. Hor. gr. 428.IX.8 is available in two entirely different versions in *SE* 12 and in the genethliological treatises of Māshā'allāh and al-Khayyāt. Unless the Arabic astrologers completely rewrote the interpretation of this nativity, it must have been extensively discussed in the original compendium. The importance of this horoscope may then imply it is another royal horoscope, probably of the emperor Zeno himself. T. D. Barnes, "The Horoscope of Licinius Sura?" *Phoenix* 30 (1976): 76 n. 2, has already raised the possibility of this horoscope's being either Zeno's or his successor Anastasius's; of the two, the nativity of the astrologer's patron is more likely. Furthermore, although such reverse engineering certainly cannot provide confirmation, by following the procedure of ascertaining the beginning of the native's successful life period, also exemplified in Pamprepus's nativity (*ME* 113), we obtain the following results: the rising time of Virgo, the zodiacal sign of Mars—which is the first trigonal lord of the ruling light, the moon—for clima 5 indicates 42 years 9 month and 10 days, pointing to 18 June 471. This year was marked by the execution of Aspar, Zeno's powerful rival, which paved the way to his eventual accession as the Augustus in the East.

100 *CCAG* 1:141, manuscript group I. For a comprehensive list, see Pingree, "Antiochus and Rhetorius" (n. 1 above), 209–10; to Pingree's list must be added *U*, which mistakenly appears among the manuscripts of Epitome IIa.

where a selection corresponding to *ME* 24–32 is found as chapters 149–53 (fols. 281v–282v), anonymously.

Pingree claimed that this text, which covers *ME* 1–2, 4–5, 8–11, 17–18, 22, 24–44, and 46–47, is an epitome from the more complete variant, his Epitome II, and referred to it as Epitome IIb; furthermore, following Boll and others, he asserted that the original compendium was in fact written by Rhetorius and that it is simply coincidence that of the epitomes, only Epitome IIb preserved Rhetorius's name.<sup>101</sup> These claims would also imply that it was Rhetorius who used Anon.'s casebook nativities, or that he is identical with this obscure author.

Making the identification of the compendium's author with Rhetorius even more compelling, the other excerpts attributed to him are all related to the compendium:

- II *App.* A17 and A18, which are also present in *T*, where only A17 is attributed to him; A17 is also found embedded in *LH* 25, anonymously.
- III *SE* 23 in the version of *BZH*, which is anonymous in the more extended version of *X*.
- IV *Signs* in *D* (though attributed to Teucer of Babylon in *U* and anonymous in *X*), to which perhaps *Plan.* should also be added.
- V *App.* A23a, which appears only in this manuscript, unlike the anonymous *App.* A23—a variant text—which is also present in *V* (fol. 163–163v) and "Balchus" 6.
- VI Chapter 221 in *B* (corresponding to 2.142 [book II, chap. 142] in *Z* and chap. 232 in *H*),<sup>102</sup> a version of *ME* 100, which itself is abbreviated as *SE* 24.

The last two excerpts are the most intriguing because they are extant in two versions in the same manuscripts, where the shorter and simpler versions are attributed to Rhetorius and the longer ones are anonymous. In the case of Exc. VI, the longer version, which

101 Pingree, "Antiochus and Rhetorius," 220–22, and "From Alexandria to Baghdād" (n. 3 above), 9. Previously, as can be inferred from an earlier remark (Pingree, *Dorothei Sidonii carmen* [n. 5 above], xii: "vir astrologiae peritissimus Rhetorius Aegyptus falso, ut opinor, appellatus") and from his practice of placing Rhetorius's name between quotation marks, Pingree had doubted the validity of this identification, but he explained neither the reasons for his doubts nor why he changed his mind.

102 It was edited from *BH* by Olivieri in *CCAG* 2:212–13.

was incorporated into the compendium, also contains some specific precepts borrowed from Valens, which the Rhetorius version does not.<sup>103</sup>

This phenomenon has been explained by merely viewing the shorter versions as epitomized from the longer versions.<sup>104</sup> But I present an alternative theory here: the available evidence can also suggest that Rhetorius was in fact a source for the author of the compendium. According to this account,

- Exc. I is possibly Rhetorius's original text, though only a substantial excerpt from his original and not the entire work.<sup>105</sup> In this excerpt, there are four references to *Signs* and *Plan.*,<sup>106</sup> indicating that the original of the latter must also be added to Exc. IV.
- Rhetorius's authorship may have been indicated in the original compendium for Excerpts II–IV, which would also explain why only one chapter but not the entirety of *SE* is attributed to him. It is not clear, however, whether Rhetorius's original is still extant among the versions of Excerpts III and IV.<sup>107</sup>

103 *SE* 2.4, p. 188.6–8 O. This section of *ME* 100 (on fol. 134–134v in *R*), which has not been edited, differs only in omitting the phrase καθώς Οὐάλης—but read πρὸς τὸ ἡμισυ καὶ τρίτον καὶ διμοιραῖον for Olivieri's πρὸς τὸν Λέοντα (?), Σκορπίον καὶ Παρθένον (?); it is a reference to the instructions given in Vett. Val. 7.6. The same *SE* 2.4 also contains a reference to the “tables and rising times of Valens” (p. 188.3–4 O), which is missing from *ME* and may be a supplementation by the ninth-century redactor. In any case, the references to Valens and the usage of his techniques are entirely absent from the Rhetorius version.

104 For Exc. VI, see Pingree, “Antiochus and Rhetorius,” 221. Also, idem, “From Alexandria to Baghdād,” 9, calls Exc. I a “more drastic revision [of Epitome II than Epitome IIa],” but neither Pingree nor anyone else has explicitly explained the co-presence of Exc. V and a longer but substantially identical text.

105 The differences, however minimal, between *ME* and Exc. I must also be noted: Mercury is said to be androgynous, not masculine as in *ME* 2; and confinement (ἐμπερίσχεσις) affects the sun, not any planet in between as in *ME* 41 (though this may be simply a mistake). Also, intervention (μεσεμβόλησις) is said to be performed by the sun, which matches the correction of *ME* 36a in *L*.

106 The references to *Signs*: p. 146.15–19 Bo (corresponding to *ME* 4) and p. 220.10 BW (corresponding to *ME* 11); to *Plan.*: p. 149.7 Bo (corresponding to *ME* 9) and p. 220.14 BW (corresponding to *ME* 11). Also note that while *ME* 10, p. 149.24 Bo, refers to *ME* 54, the corresponding chapter in Exc. I lacks the reference. If, therefore, Exc. I was an epitome from *ME*, the deletion of the reference would indicate an extraordinarily meticulous editorial intervention.

107 Because Anon. supplemented Rhetorius's text in the cases of Excerpts V and VI, I assume he is likely to have done so in the

- In the case of Exc. V, the scribe of *R* or its ancestor found Rhetorius's original text and copied it after the version present in the compendium.
- Finally, for Exc. VI, the scribe of the common hyparchetype of *BZH* found and copied Rhetorius's original text without noticing that the ninth-century redactor's revised version had already been copied.

Though some might question my account as highly hypothetical and diverging far from the present *communis opinio*, it nonetheless provides an explanation of why two versions of the same texts are incorporated into the same manuscripts or even into the same chapters, something not adequately explained to date. Furthermore, the conspicuous absence of Rhetorius's name in the Arabic literature, which is otherwise heavily indebted to the author of the compendium, can be explained if he was simply a source of another author who—given his politically sensitive cases—may have wished to remain anonymous.

### *A Text on the Commixtures of the Planets*

There is one remaining fragment attributed to Rhetorius (hereafter Exc. VII) that has not yet been listed: a section of an unnumbered chapter in book II of *V* on fol. 156.<sup>108</sup> It describes the signification of the trigonal configuration of Mars and Saturn and adds some more general remarks about the favorable indications of trigons. Incidentally, the same fragment is found embedded, with negligible differences, in a lengthy chapter titled Περί κράσεως καὶ φύσεως τῶν ἀστέρων καὶ τῶν ἀποτελουμένων καὶ σημαινόμενων ἐκ τῆς συμπαρουσίας καὶ τοῦ σχηματισμοῦ αὐτῶν (On the temperament and nature of the stars and the indications and significations based on their co-presence and figuration; hereafter *Mixt.*), extant in *H* and Venice, BNM, gr. Z. 334 (coll. 553; hereafter *C*), a manuscript copied in the middle of the thirteenth century.<sup>109</sup> As the title

remaining cases as well. Therefore, I conjecture the following: *SE* 22–23 in the version of *BZH* is the ninth-century redactor's revision from Anon.'s version, which is closely resembled by the variant in *X*, while Rhetorius's original is lost; also, Rhetorius's originals of *Signs* and *Plan.* are lost, and their form cannot be reconstructed.

108 It was edited by Heeg in *CCAG* 5.3:124.32–125.2.

109 *C*, chap. C67 on fols. 184–191 and *H*, chap. A197 on fols. 149v–158. It was edited first by Kroll in *CCAG* 2:159–80, but also as Vett. Val. *app.* 1 by Pingree. The section corresponding to Exc. VII is *Mixt.* 55–57; the only significant differences are that *Mixt.* 56,

suggests, it describes the natures and the significations of the planets themselves as well as the significations of their bodily conjunctions and configurations; it apparently draws on the views of Dorotheus, Ptolemy, and Valens, and it also cites Dorotheus's verses and uses two of Valens's casebook nativities as illustrations.<sup>110</sup>

At first glance, *Mixt.* seems a perfect candidate for the text on the commixtures hinted at in *Plan.* in the versions of *X* and Isidorus, which is a variant of Rhetorius's Exc. IV. The fuller picture is more complicated, however. In the sections on Saturn and on Mercury, *X* explicitly says the planets' appearances in each other's houses will be also described in the chapter on the commixtures.<sup>111</sup> But no information of this sort is present in *Mixt.*, though *CH* each contain a separate chapter dealing with this very subject.<sup>112</sup> In addition, both *Plan.* and *Mixt.* rely on Valens's descriptions of planetary rulership and the body parts assigned to planets, and many of those descriptions in the two texts overlap. It is difficult to imagine that the same author would repeat himself so extensively. These observations suggest that *Mixt.* and possibly the other chapter on the planets in the houses, even if based on Rhetorius's text, were probably also revised.

At the same time, Exc. VII is based on Dorotheus, as a comparison with the partial Dorotheus paraphrase (again extant in *CH*) and the Arabic translations reveals.<sup>113</sup> This comparison also demonstrates that

Rhetorius here inserted the general remarks, which he had drawn from another section of Dorotheus's poem.<sup>114</sup>

By sheer coincidence, Julianus of Laodicea preserves Dorotheus's original verse, and *ME* 3, the equivalent of which is absent from Rhetorius's Exc. I, also paraphrases the line.<sup>115</sup> But even more important, the paraphrases as well as their contexts and interpretations in Rhetorius's Exc. VII (and in *Mixt.*) and Anon.'s *ME* 3 differ considerably,<sup>116</sup> and that feature also suggests that it was not Rhetorius who composed the compendium.

### *A Tentative Dating for Rhetorius*

If we are to debate Rhetorius's authorship of the compendium, it is worth examining what else can be learned about this obscure person. However, nothing substantial is known about him beyond the relative uncommonness of his name. There are only three testimonies that can be examined:

- In the eleventh century, Michael Psellus (*Or. fun.* 3.26.6–11 Polemis) mentioned his name in the company of Hephaestio of Thebes (early fifth century) and Valens (mid–late second century) and cited a few basic astrological concepts and

p. 165.4 K = p. 373.21 P, writes ἐξάγωνα while Exc. VII, p. 124.34 He, has αἱ συμπαρουσίαι (perhaps owing to a scribal error in the hyparchetype), and Exc. VII appears to be incomplete.

110 For the verses and the identifiable fragments of dactylic hexameters, see S. Heilen, "Anubio Reconsidered," *Aestimatio* 7 (2010): 155–56. Valens's casebook nativities are Hor. gr. 122.XII.4 and 118.XI.26, adapted from Vett. Val. 7.3.18–22 and 7.3.23–29, respectively.

111 *Plan.*, pp. 215.24–25 and 221.29–30 Bo, respectively.

112 It is titled Τοπικαὶ διακρίσεις (Determinations based on the placement [of the stars]) in *C* (chap. C51 on fols. 176v–178) and *H* (chap. A195 on fols. 145v–147), the content of which is borrowed from Dorotheus. It was edited in Pingree, *Dorothei Sidonii carmen*, 357–61.

113 Though titled Περί τῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους σχηματισμῶν τῶν ἀστέρων ἐκ τῶν Ἀνουβίωνος (On the mutual figurations of the stars from Anubio) in *C* (chap. C50 on fols. 173v–176) and *H* (chap. A193 on fols. 140v–144), the paraphrase in fact derives mostly from Dorotheus; see Heilen, "Anubio Reconsidered," 133–36. It was edited by Olivieri in *CCAG* 2:204–12, and again in Pingree, *Dorothei Sidonii carmen*, 345–54; the relevant section is related to Dorotheus. 2.14.4 (see also V. Stegemann, "Dorotheos von Sidon und Firmicus Maternus," *Hermes* 78 [1943]: 113–31, on a different Arabic translation in Leiden, UL, Or. 891, fols. 1–27, where it is on

fols. 2), which corresponds to p. 204.16–18 O = p. 345.15–18 P of the paraphrase.

114 Possibly from book I, but no Arabic equivalent can be identified. Pingree's identification, Dorotheus. 1.6.2, is entirely different and so should not be trusted.

115 Julianus's citation is in *App.* A42, also found in Vienna, ÖNB, phil. gr. 179 (fols. 79–80v) and "Balchus" 75. It was edited from the Vienna manuscript and *E* by Cumont in *CCAG* 4:103–6, where it is on p. 105.13.

116 The original line, cited by Julianus, is "σχήμασι τριπλεύροις κακοεργέες ἀμβλύνονται." Rhetorius paraphrased it interpretively as "τὰ τρίγωνα . . . τῶν σχημάτων τῶν . . . φθοροποιῶν τὴν κακίαν ἀμβλύνουσιν" (both Exc. VII, pp. 124.34–125.1 He, and *Mixt.* 56, p. 165.4–6 K = p. 373.21–23 P), apparently understood as declaring that the nature of the malefics is eased when they are in trigon with each other. In *ME* 3 (p. 146.11 Bo), the paraphrase is a prose rendering as τριπλευροὶ γὰρ κακοεργοὶ ἀμβλύνονται, which illustrates the maxim that the good condition of the malefics magnifies the native's good fortune but provides no indication of how the teaching is to be understood. In any case, Julianus interprets the line as the malefics being abated when they are in trigon with the moon or the ascendant (p. 105.11–12 Cu). For a joint reedition of these variants, with-out *Mixt.* 56, see also Pingree, *Dorothei Sidonii carmen*, 325–26.

conditions that are all found in the known fragments of Rhetorius.<sup>117</sup>

- In the twelfth century, John Tzetzes (*Ex.* 1.1.124) alluded to him together with Ammon, Timaeus, Ptolemy, Paulus of Alexandria, Anubio, Colocynthus, Protagoras, and Dorotheus. Except for Ammon and Colocynthus, who are known only via Tzetzes and cannot be dated, each of these authors lived before 400.
- Also in the twelfth century, John Camaterus (*Intr.* 92–96; cf. 1287) called him “Rhetorius of Egypt,” considered him one of the “old (παλαιοί) astrologers,” and ascribed to him a treatment of the zodiacal signs.<sup>118</sup>

Otherwise, there are four known Rhetorii, none of whom are listed in the prosopographies:

- A fictitious bishop of Rome at the time of Alexander Severus (222–235) is called Rhetorius in the martyrology of St. Tatiana (chap. 19), which was composed in the seventh century at the earliest.
- Filaster (91.1) names a Rhetorius as the founder of the Rhetorian heresy, which was present in Alexandria in the fourth century. This Rhetorius is also referred to by Athanasius in a late work (*Apoll.* 1.16) in a fashion that implies that he may have lived decades or even centuries earlier.<sup>119</sup>
- Rhetorius, son of the Egyptian grammarian Didymus, appears in Libanius’s letters (*Ep.* 317 and 318;

*Ep.* 404 is addressed to Rhetorius himself). He studied with Libanius in Nicomedia around 345 and therefore was born around 330. He obtained a classical education, and between 355 and 357 he returned to Egypt to reclaim his paternal heritage.<sup>120</sup>

- A presbyter Rhetorius is mentioned in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon of 451 (C. Calch. act. 394).

Certainly, nothing compels us to identify the astrologer Rhetorius with any of these Rhetorii—including the most attractive candidate, the son of Didymus. But it is instructive that the astrologer Rhetorius relied extensively on Ptolemy,<sup>121</sup> whose astrology had meager impact before the fourth century,<sup>122</sup> and his other identifiable sources include only Teucer, Dorotheus, Valens, and Antiochus, who all worked before ca. 300. Furthermore, a hypothesis that the astrologer Rhetorius lived in the fourth century would explain two peculiarities.

First, though Rhetorius claims to have discovered the importance of a planet’s being in exact conjunction with the sun, Paulus of Alexandria, writing in 378, seems to be completely aware of the value of this condition.<sup>123</sup> And second, he knows about the seven “Hermetic” lots, which appear in only two other sources: Paulus and a horoscope dated to 319.<sup>124</sup> The dating of both these two sources to the fourth century suggests that Πανάρετος,

117 These are ἐπιμαρτυρία (cf. *Plan.*, p. 221.29 Bo, only in the version of *X*, which must be related to Rhetorius’s *Exc.* IV), δορυφορία (cf. *ME* 24–26, by which here and henceforth the corresponding chapter in *Exc.* I is understood), ὁμορρόησις (cf. *ME* 40), and ἀντανάλυσις (cf. *ME* 32); for the powers of the angles and the twelve-fold arrangement of the circle, see *ME* 46.

118 This ascription, together with Camaterus’s extensive reliance in the section on the zodiacal signs (*Intr.* 156–172.4) on the same version of *Signs* that appears in *D*, suggests that he had a version at hand that attributed the text to Rhetorius. Though he may also have used *Plan.* for the colors and tastes associated with the planets (*Intr.* 202.8–35)—a section not extant in *D*—he seems to have supplemented it with matters from elsewhere; and for the body parts, he prefers Ptolemy over *Plan.* (*Intr.* 201.7–27, cf. *Ptol. Tetr.* 3.13.5). In any event, Rhetorius is not mentioned there.

119 On the Rhetorians, see É. Amann, “Rhétoriens,” in *DTC* 13:2654–55. The conjecture of Fabricius, the editor of Filaster in *Patrologia Latina*, that Rhetorius may be identical with the rhetor Themistius is certainly highly speculative.

120 See R. A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1988), 269–70 no. 46, with further literature.

121 Ptolemy’s views are utilized in *ME* 1, 8–9, 42, and 46, and he is even referred to in *ME* 2 and *Signs* in the version of *D*.

122 According to Jones, “Ancient Rejection” (n. 15 above), 39–40, Ptolemaic astronomy was completely accepted only in the fourth century. The earliest known horoscopes calculated with Ptolemy’s tables are Hor. gr. 327.VIII.17, which still uses Theon’s formula, and Hor. gr. 380.XI.26, the nativity of Hephaestio of Thebes, in which Theon’s formula is for the first time verifiably abandoned in favor of the true tropical frame. Nevertheless, Porphyry (third century) and Pancharius (perhaps third century, and possibly preceding Porphyry) are known to have composed a commentary to Ptolemy’s *Apotelesmatica* before those horoscopes.

123 *ME* 2, p. 145.23–30 Bo; cf. Paul. Al. 14, p. 29.16–22 Boer.

124 *ME* 47; cf. Paul. Al. 23, pp. 47.15–52.8 Bo, and Hor. gr. 319. XI.19, coll. viii–xvii, lines 7–13, edited in D. G. Greenbaum and A. Jones, “P.Berl. 9825: An Elaborate Horoscope for 319 CE and Its Significance for Greek Astronomical and Astrological Practice,” *ISAW Papers* 12 (2017), <http://doi.org/2333.1/brv15m2n>.



the work that described them, may have been written not long before the early fourth century.<sup>125</sup>

Still, it cannot be definitively proven that Rhetorius did work in the fourth century.<sup>126</sup>



If my hypotheses are correct, Rhetorius, who may or may not be identical with the Egyptian Rhetorius, son of Didymus (born ca. 330), wrote one or more astrological works well before 504, perhaps in the fourth century. His original work or works included descriptions of the zodiacal signs and their notable degrees,

125 That this seven-lot scheme was invented relatively late is implied by its apparently being a revision and extension of a four-lot scheme (the lots of fortune, spirit, love, and necessity) attested in Valens, Firmicus, and probably Dorotheus; see D. G. Greenbaum, *The Daimon in Hellenistic Astrology: Origins and Influence* (Leiden, 2016), 360–67, 475.

126 Another case could be made to identify Rhetorius with the author, working in 480, who composed a few chapters now found in *LH*, since data corresponding to the first part of his Exc. II and the stars and asterisms mentioned in Exc. IV can be discovered in *LH*; but the overlapping content between *LH* and Rhetorius ends there.

the planets, and their configurations; a general introduction to astrology and genethliology proper; specific genethliological matters—of which only sections on the topics of conception and parents are extant; and a treatment of inceptions.

Rhetorius's work was updated and supplemented with matters drawn from Paulus of Alexandria, Julianus of Laodicea, and possibly others by an anonymous astrologer, formerly working for the emperor Zeno, in 504 or shortly thereafter. Therefore the epitomes and fragments formerly attributed to Rhetorius must instead be assigned to this mysterious astrologer, whose identity cannot be ascertained. This anonymity might well have been deliberate, which also explains why later astrologers would be ignorant of his name even though his teachings enjoyed great popularity among them.

Department of Philosophy and  
History of Science  
Budapest University of  
Technology and Economics  
Egry József u. 1, E612  
1111 Budapest, Hungary  
levente.laszlo@filozofia.bme.hu

## Appendix

## Editors

Bo	F. Boll
BW	F. Boer and S. Weinstock
CK	F. Cumont and Kroll
Cu	F. Cumont
H	J. Heeg
K	W. Kroll
O	A. Olivieri
P	D. Pingree
Z	C. O. Zuretti

## Texts

<i>A</i>	Milan, VBA, B 38 sup. (Martini–Bassi 88)
<i>App.</i>	untitled book VI of <i>R</i>
<i>B</i>	Paris, BNF, gr. 2506
<i>C</i>	Venice, BNM, gr. Z. 334 (coll. 553)
<i>D</i>	Berlin, SB, Phillips 1577 (gr. 117)
<i>E</i>	Rome, Biblioteca Angelica, gr. 29
Exc. I	Pingree's Epitome IIb (Rhetorius)
Exc. II	<i>App.</i> A17 and A18 (Rhetorius)
Exc. III	<i>SE</i> 23 in <i>B Z H</i> (Rhetorius)
Exc. IV	<i>Signs</i> and <i>Plan.</i> in <i>D</i> (Rhetorius)
Exc. V	<i>App.</i> A23a (Rhetorius)
Exc. VI	<i>SE</i> 22I (Rhetorius)
Exc. VII	a section of an unnumbered chapter in book II of <i>V</i> on fol. 156 (Rhetorius)
<i>G</i>	Paris, BNF, gr. 2419
<i>H</i>	Venice, BNM, gr. Z. 335 (coll. 645)
<i>L</i>	Florence, BML, Plut. 28.34
<i>LH</i>	<i>Liber Hermetis</i>
<i>ME</i>	main epitome (Pingree's Epitome II and III)
<i>Mixt.</i>	Περὶ κράσεως καὶ φύσεως τῶν ἀστέρων καὶ τῶν ἀποτελουμένων καὶ σημεινομένων ἐκ τῆς συμπαρουσίας καὶ τοῦ σχηματισμοῦ αὐτῶν = <i>C</i> , chap. B67; <i>H</i> , chap. A197
<i>Plan.</i>	chapter in <i>X</i> (fols. 236v–239) and elsewhere on the planets
<i>R</i>	Paris, BNF, gr. 2425
<i>SE</i>	secondary epitome (Pingree's Epitome IV)
<i>Signs</i>	chapter in <i>X</i> (fols. 232v–236v) and elsewhere on the zodiacal signs
<i>T</i>	Oxford, Bodleian, Selden Supra 17 (Selden 16)
<i>TOD</i>	untitled treatise in <i>H</i> and elsewhere that begins Τῆς οὐρανίας διαθέσεως
<i>U</i>	Vienna, ÖNB, phil. gr. 108
<i>V</i>	Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 1056
<i>X</i>	Vatican City, BAV, Vat. gr. 191
<i>Z</i>	Paris, BNF, gr. 2424